N.H.M.S.
VOL.
XLI

REEVES — HERALDS OF THAT GOOD ... M

JOHN C. REEVES

HERALDS OF THAT GOOD REALM

Syro-Mesopotamian Gnosis and Jewish Traditions

HERALDS OF THAT GOOD REALM

NAG HAMMADI AND MANICHAEAN STUDIES

FORMERLY

NAG HAMMADI STUDIES

EDITED BY

J.M. ROBINSON & H.J. KLIMKEIT

Editorial Board

H.W. Attridge, R. Cameron, W.-P. Funk, C.W. Hedrick,
H. Jackson, P. Nagel, J. van Oort, D.M. Parrott, B.A. Pearson, K. Rudolph,
H.-M. Schenke, W. Sundermann

XLI

HERALDS OF THAT GOOD REALM

Syro-Mesopotamian Gnosis and Jewish Traditions

BY

JOHN C. REEVES

E.J. BRILL
LEIDEN · NEW YORK · KÖLN
1996

The paper in this book meets the guidelines for permanence and durability of the Committee on Production Guidelines for Book Longevity of the Council on Library Resources.

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Reeves, John C.:
Heralds of that good realm : Syro-Mesopotamian gnosis and Jewish traditions / by John C. Reeves.
p. cm. — Nag Hammadi and Manichaean studies, ISSN 0929-2470 ; 41)
Includes bibliographical references and index.
ISBN 9004104593 (cloth : alk. paper)
1. Manichaeism—Syria. 2. Manichaeism—Iraq. 3. Cologne Mani codex. 4. Apocryphal books (Old Testament) 5. Patriarchs (Bible) 6. Syria—Religion. 7. Iraq—Religion. I. Title. II. Series.
BT1410.R43 1996
299'.932—dc20 96-17953
CIP

Die Deutsche Bibliothek – CIP-Einheitsaufnahme

Reeves, John C.:
Heralds of that good realm : Syro-Mesopotamian gnosis and Jewish traditions / by John C. Reeves. – Leiden ; New York ; Köln : Brill, 1996
(Nag Hammadi and Manichaean studies : 41)
ISBN 90-04-10459-3
NE: GT

ISSN 0929-2470
ISBN 90 04 10459 3

© Copyright 1996 by E.J. Brill, Leiden, The Netherlands

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, translated, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise, without prior written permission from the publisher.

Authorization to photocopy items for internal or personal use is granted by E.J. Brill provided that the appropriate fees are paid directly to The Copyright Clearance Center, 222 Rosewood Drive, Suite 910 Danvers MA 01923, USA. Fees are subject to change.

PRINTED IN THE NETHERLANDS

In memoriam

William D. Reeves

1928-1996

CONTENTS

Preface and Acknowledgments.....ix
Supplemental Abbreviations and Short References.....xi

PART ONE

FROM FOREFATHERS TO HERALDS:
THE TRANSFORMATION OF BIBLICAL PRIMEVAL HISTORY

Chapter One: Manichaeism and the Biblical Forefathers.....5
The Succession of Incarnations of the Apostle of Light.....7
The *Cologne Mani Codex* and the Prophetic Succession.....15
Chapter Two: The Forefathers as Authors in Late Antique and Medieval Near Eastern Religious Traditions.....31
Books of Adam.....33
Books of Seth.....36
Books of Enosh.....37
Books of Shem.....38
Books of Enoch.....39
Modes of Transmission.....42

PART TWO

THE *CMC* APOCALYPSE FRAGMENTS
AND JEWISH PSEUDEPIGRAPHA

Chapter Three: The Apocalypse of Adam.....67
Appendix: A Treasury of Manichaean Adam Traditions.....79

Chapter Four: The Apocalypse of Sethel.....111
Excursus: Seth as Recurrent Salvific Avatar.....126
Chapter Five: The Apocalypse of Enosh.....141
Chapter Six: The Apocalypse of Shem.....163
Chapter Seven: The Apocalypse of Enoch.....183

CONCLUSION

Chapter Eight: Reassessing Syro-Mesopotamian Gnosis and Jewish Traditions: Some Concluding Remarks.....209

Bibliography.....212
Index of Citations.....231
Index of Ancient and Medieval Authorities.....246
Index of Modern Authors.....247

PREFACE AND ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Ephrem Syrus caustically remarks at one place in his *Prose Refutations* that the Manichaeans "say of Egyptian Hermes and of the Greek Plato and of Jesus who appeared in Judaea that *they were heralds of that Good (Realm) to the world* ..." (ed. Mitchell 2.208). This observation, apparently based upon a quotation from an unidentified Manichaean source and intended by Ephrem to discredit the Manichaean concept of a periodic dispatch to earth of representatives of the supernal Realm of Light, encapsulates the thematic core of the present monograph. It offers a systematic examination, from a comparative perspective, of the extant Manichaean (as well as non-Manichaean) rosters of authentic predecessors who purportedly proclaimed the Religion of Light prior to the advent of Mani, "seal of the prophets," and examines the implications of this particular doctrine for the origins of Manichaeism.

Chapter One collects and analyzes those texts which speak of prophetic predecessors, and isolates the credentials considered requisite for such status within Manichaeism. Especially intriguing in this list-tradition is the occurrence of the names of some prominent biblical antediluvian forefathers, such as Adam, Seth, and Enoch. Given the well documented hostility of mature Manichaeism to the personalities and teachings of the Hebrew Bible, it becomes necessary to explicate this apparent anomaly.

A survey of biblical pseudepigraphic literary activity in the late antique Near East follows in Chapter Two, with special attention being devoted to the quotations from revelatory works ("apocalypses") attributed to five biblical forefathers which are cited in the *Cologne Mani Codex*, a relatively new source which has revolutionized the study of nascent Manichaeism. These forefathers are Adam, Seth, Enosh, Shem, and Enoch. This descriptive sketch does not limit itself to Jewish sources alone, but draws as well upon information found in Christian, gnostic, non-biblical, and Muslim literature produced throughout the first millennium (and in some cases beyond) CE. A special section of this chapter attempts to trace the avenues for the transmission of pseudepigraphic literature and motifs from their largely Jewish cultural contexts in Palestine to the emergent gnostic milieux of Syria and Mesopotamia.

The heart of the work, comprising Chapters Three through Seven, consists of a rigorous philological, literary, and religio-historical analysis of the five pseudepigraphic citations preserved in the *Cologne Mani Codex*. Each of these chapters presents the Greek text of the excerpt, an English translation, and a lengthy detailed commentary to the passage. In addition,

these chapters offer a number of hypotheses regarding the original provenance of each citation and the means by which it has been adapted, if at all, to its present narrative context. The final chapter (Chapter Eight) briefly synopsizes the results of the present investigation, and offers some deliberately provocative assertions and suggestions to fuel further research and discussion.

The bibliographical abbreviations employed within the annotations should be familiar to students of the history of religions in late antiquity. I have endeavored in most instances to adhere to the stylistic guidelines of the *Journal of Biblical Literature*, a convenient exposition of which is set forth in *JBL* 107 (1988) 583-96. For more specialized works or journals not included in the *JBL* list, I have prepared a special supplemental list of abbreviations for consultation. As a concession to modern reading habits, I provide full bibliographic information for the initial citations of the scholarly literature in each chapter, even if the work was already referenced in an earlier chapter. This will permit readers to consult chapters out of their published sequence without sacrificing intelligibility.

Some of the material contained in the present work was first presented in oral form during the annual sessions of the Manichaeism Group of the Society of Biblical Literature, and I would like to thank my numerous questioners, respondents, and correspondents for their vocal (and sometimes written) interest in my work. My wife Lu and my son Daniel have patiently tolerated the many hours of cloistered rumination and composition that this project has entailed, and I am grateful for their indulgence. I also thank the interlibrary loan staff of Dacus Library at Winthrop University for their cheerful acceptance and efficient handling of what must have seemed a veritable plethora of esoteric requests. My initial labors upon the manuscript were financially underwritten by a 1994 summer stipend from the National Endowment for the Humanities, to whom I publicly tender my thanks. I am furthermore especially grateful to Jason BeDuhn, David Frankfurter, and Steve Wasserstrom, each of whom graciously consented to read and critique large portions of the present work during the early stages of its preparation, and each of whom has stimulated me in countless ways via their publications and conversations.

Finally, I dedicate this book to the memory of my father, who passed away shortly before the manuscript went to press. He always took a great interest in my scholarly labors and activities, and was a steady source of quiet encouragement and sound advice. He freely gave to me much more than I could ever hope to repay in kind. May his memory forever be for a blessing.

SUPPLEMENTAL ABBREVIATIONS AND SHORT REFERENCES

AIUON	*Annali Istituto universitario orientale di Napoli*
AOT (Sparks)	*The Apocryphal Old Testament* (ed. H.F.D. Sparks; Oxford: Clarendon, 1984)
APAW	*Abhandlungen der preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften in Berlin*
BHM	*Bet ha-Midrasch* (6 vols.; ed. A. Jellinek; reprinted, Jerusalem: Bamberger & Wahrmann, 1938)
CMC	*Cologne Mani Codex*
CSHB	*Corpus Scriptorum Historiae Byzantinae* (Bonn: Weber, 1828-97)
EI^2	*The Encyclopaedia of Islam*, new edition (Leiden: Brill, 1960-)
ERE	*Encyclopaedia of Religion and Ethics* (13 vols.; ed. J. Hastings; Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1917-27)
Finkelstein	*Sifre Devarim* (ed. L. Finkelstein; reprinted, New York: Jewish Theological Seminary of America, 1969)
Friedmann	*Midrash Pesiqta Rabbati* (ed. M. Ish-Shalom; Vienna, 1880)
Ginzā	M. Lidzbarski, *Ginzā: Der Schatz oder das grosse Buch der Mandäer* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1925)
Homilies	H.J. Polotsky, *Manichäische Handschriften der Sammlung A. Chester Beatty, Band I: Manichäische Homilien* (Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer, 1934)
Horovitz-Rabin	*Mekhilta de-Rabbi Yishmael* (ed. H.S. Horovitz and I.A. Rabin; reprinted, Jerusalem: Wahrmann, 1970)
HSCP	*Harvard Studies in Classical Philology*
JE	*The Jewish Encyclopaedia* (12 vols.; New York & London, 1901-06)
Kephalaia	*Manichäische Handschriften der Staatlichen Museen, Berlin, Band I: Kephalaia, 1. Hälfte* (ed. H.J. Polotsky and A. Böhlig; Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer, 1934-40); *2. Hälfte (Lfg. 11/12)* (Stuttgart, 1966)

Margalioth	*Sefer ha-Bahir* (ed. R. Margalioth; Jerusalem, 1951)
Mir. Man. I, II, III	Andreas-Henning, "Mitteliranische Manichaica I-III"
NHC	Nag Hammadi Codex
NJPS	New Jewish Publication Society translation of the Hebrew Bible
OCA	*Orientalia Christiana Analecta*
Psalm-Book	*Manichaean Manuscripts in the Chester Beatty Collection, vol. II: A Manichaean Psalm-Book, pt. II* (ed. C.R.C. Allberry; Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer, 1938)
Schechter	*Massekhet 'Abot de-Rabbi Natan* (ed. S. Schechter; Wien: C.D. Lippe, 1887)
Scholem	*Das Buch Bahir* (Leipzig: W. Drugulin, 1923)
Theodor-Albeck	*Midrash Bereshit Rabba* (3 vols.; ed. J. Theodor and H. Albeck; reprinted, Jerusalem: Wahrmann, 1965)
ZPE	*Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik*

"La théologie manichéenne est pleine de fictions hardies et bizarres, dont il est difficile de découvrir l'origine."

I. de Beausobre, *Histoire critique* ... 2.554 (1739)

PART ONE

FROM FOREFATHERS TO HERALDS:

THE TRANSFORMATION OF BIBLICAL PRIMEVAL HISTORY

CHAPTER ONE

MANICHAEISM AND THE BIBLICAL FOREFATHERS

One of the most significant manuscript finds relating to the study of Manichaeism was the discovery and decipherment in 1969 at the University of Cologne of a diminuitive Greek uncial codex containing a hagiographical recountal of the early life of Mani, the religion's founder and authoritative teacher.[1] The actual archaeological origin of the codex was admittedly obscure. Those familiar with the history of the western spread of Manichaeism postulated that it came from Upper Egypt, probably from the area of Lycopolis,[2] a point of entry for Manichaean missions in the third and fourth centuries CE, and a place where Manichaean communities are well attested in late antiquity.[3] Palaeographical analysis of the Greek script employed in the newly recovered codex suggested the fourth or fifth centuries CE as the probable date of its preparation.[4] A closer study of the narrative suggested to its modern editors that the Greek text was actually a translation of an Aramaic *Grundschrift*,[5] an assessment which if accurate would mean that the work could originate from the earliest decades of the existence of Manichaeism in Mesopotamia. Given that much of the narrative is autobiographical in form, portions of the *Codex* may even ultimately derive from the *ipsissima verba* of Mani himself (216-276 CE). Although badly damaged, particularly in its latter half, approximately one hundred and ninety-two leaves survive for modern study.

The contents of the *Cologne Mani Codex* (henceforth *CMC* or *Codex*) are little short of revolutionary for the evaluation of the ideological background of the youthful Mani. Much of the extant text relates certain formative events experienced by Mani while being raised and educated among a Jewish-Christian sectarian community in southern Mesopotamia. Notices of his childhood and adolescent upbringing among such a sect had been mentioned by two of the most important heresiological sources for the recovery of Manichaean traditions and doctrines; *viz.*, those of the Nestorian patriarch Theodore bar Konai[6] and the Muslim bibliophile Ibn al-Nadīm,[7] but little evidence existed outside their accounts, certainly not within authentic Manichaean writings, to confirm this tradition. Not only is the veracity of this polemical tradition affirmed by the *Codex*, but we also learn from it the identity of the sect's founder—Elchasai, an exceedingly intriguing Jewish-Christian visionary who apparently lived and taught in late first-century CE Palestine and Transjordania,[8] and regarding whom some information is preserved by Christian (and Muslim) heresiologists.[9] The implications of this

new knowledge are profound and far-reaching. Not the least among them is the dawning realization that there is a genetic linkage—conceptual, ideological, and most importantly, literary—between the intellectual circles of Second Temple and late antique heterodox Judaism (among which can be included the various Jesus-movements) and late antique Syrian and Mesopotamian syncretic currents (incorporating also pagan, Hellenistic, and Iranian motifs), a linkage which illuminates and explains many otherwise puzzling textual correspondences and correlations found among these regions.[10]

The surviving leaves of the *Codex* betray the editorial hands of one or more redactors who have manipulated the narrative to assume the shape it now bears. In many cases, the name of the tradent responsible for the structure of a certain block of tradition is preserved in a "section" heading, a formal practice of attribution that has been rightly compared to the ascription of traditions to named rabbinic Sages,[11] or to the Islamic *isnād*, the transmission of *ḥadīth* through an authoritative line of tradents.[12] As a result of this editorial arrangement, the contents of the *Codex* can be described and summarized fairly neatly as follows. Leaves 1-13 relate a detailed, largely hagiographic account of Mani's childhood among the sect. Leaves 14-44 recount the circumstances and contents of two "revelations" experienced by Mani while living among the sect—the first at age twelve, and the second at age twenty-four. There follows on leaves 45-72 a lengthy apologetic section wherein evidence is marshaled to support the authenticity of Mani's revelatory experiences. This evidence consists of quotations excerpted from five otherwise unknown Jewish pseudepigraphic "apocalypses," three citations alluding to the apostle Paul's visionary experiences, and four excerpts from Mani's later "canonical" works.[13] Leaves 72-99 provide a valuable account of the customs and rituals observed by the Elchasaite community to whom Mani belonged, and of the history of Mani's growing disenchantment and eventual opposition to them. On leaves 100-116 is the Manichaean version of Mani's departure from the sect and his initial success in winning disciples to his own teachings. The remainder of the *Codex* (leaves 117-192), which is very badly preserved, apparently continued with a description of Mani's subsequent missionary journeys throughout the ancient Orient.

While there is much of interest within the *Codex* that rightly should excite and stimulate its detailed study by students of the history of religions in late antiquity, a portion which is particularly intriguing is that apologetic section (*CMC* 45-72) mentioned earlier that features justificatory evidence for Mani's claimed status as the recipient of heavenly wisdom. A close examination of this section reveals that Mani regarded himself, and was so viewed by his adherents, as simply the latest (and perhaps the last) in a series of divinely commissioned emissaries to an almost hopelessly befuddled and estranged humanity. Especially interesting are the identities of the illustrious predecessors who are commemorated in the *Codex*. "Apocalypses" attributed to the biblical figures of Adam, Sethel (i.e., Seth),[14] Enosh, Shem, and Enoch comprise the first five (and by far the most lengthy) citations.[15] These are

followed by three brief quotations from two of the New Testament epistles of Paul.[16] The significance of Paul in Mani's intellectual development is not surprising in itself. Marcionite Christianity, whose stringent Paulinism is well known, was the strongest faction of that religion in Mesopotamia during Mani's day,[17] and scholars have sometimes remarked certain concepts within nascent Manichaeism that suggest a Marcionite patrimony.[18] A clandestine study and espousal of Paul's writings by the young Mani was probably one of the factors that precipitated his rupture from his childhood community.[19] Paul thus enjoyed a special status among the religious teachers preceding the mission of Mani.[20] The section concludes with the elevation of Mani himself to the exalted rank of these predecessors, climactically expressed by the identification of Mani with the "Paraclete of truth."[21]

It is the aforementioned pentad of primal forefathers culled from the biblical book of Genesis, along with the explicit respect accorded to literature allegedly stemming from them, that gives one pause. Manichaean literature rarely cites the Hebrew Bible. In fact, it is abundantly attested that Mani and his religion displayed a hostile, denigrating stance toward both the Hebrew Bible and the classical Judaism deriving from it. The fourth-century polemicist Titus of Bostra begins the fourth book of his treatise refuting Manichaeism by stating "he (Mani) attributes the Old Testament fully and completely to the archons of Hyle (i.e., the princes of Darkness)."[22] This is tantamount to asserting that the Hebrew Bible is of Satan, not of God, and hence totally worthless for instruction in religious matters. Yet characters belonging to this despised corpus of documents are simultaneously lauded as exemplars and emissaries of proto-Manichaeism! How can this be?

The Succession of Incarnations of the Apostle of Light

Despite Mani's avoidance of explicit citation from the Hebrew Bible, it is nevertheless plain that important characters and events mentioned in the Hebrew Bible, particularly those found within the primeval history of Genesis 1-11, play a significant role in the development of his distinctive ideology. A cursory reading of surviving Manichaean literature, as well as of the detailed reports of reliable heresiologists, readily demonstrates its biblical heritage. The Genesis accounts of creation, the experiences of Adam, Eve, and their progeny, the generational succession of the antediluvian forefathers, the angelic corruption and enslavement of humanity, the cataclysmic Flood, the preservation of wisdom for future generations of the righteous—all of these biblically based characters and episodes receive attention in Manichaean literature. Yet true to their provenance, the Manichaean texts do not relate these stories or traditions in accordance with their biblical versions. They instead employ, adapt, transmit, and further develop the interpreted forms of these stories that we often find in extra-biblical Jewish (and Christian) pseudepigraphic works and certain

aggadic traditions, or alternatively, versions that we might expect to find among such sources.[23]

It had not escaped notice among ancient polemicists that Manichaeism credited specific biblical and historical figures with distinctive roles in a progressive pattern of religious revelation. Modern manuscript discoveries, notably those at Turfan and Medinat Madi, confirmed and augmented these earlier testimonies and shed new light upon the Manichaean doctrine of "prophetic succession." According to this doctrine, a heavenly entity known as the Apostle of Light, who is in turn under the direction of the Light-*Nous*,[24] has periodically manifested itself in human guise to proclaim the Manichaean message of redemption among humanity.[25] The succession of such "prophets" is comprised initially of important biblical forefathers from primeval history and continues on to embrace renowned religious teachers of more recent vintage such as Zoroaster, the Buddha, and Jesus,[26] before culminating with the self-declared "seal of the prophets," Mani himself.[27] The importance of this concept for understanding why the Manichaeans employed pseudepigraphic works attributed to the primal forefathers, as well as for explaining the esteem such writings undoubtedly enjoyed in Manichaean circles, demands that a comprehensive inspection be given all the relevant textual evidence that can be culled from both external and internal witnesses.

Mani almost certainly inherited the concept of the periodic dispatch and sojourn of heavenly emissaries among humanity from his Elchasaite tutors. According to Hippolytus,

> They (the Elchasaites) do not confess, however, that there is but one Christ, but that there is one above and that he is infused into many bodies frequently ... he was begotten of God at one time and at another time he became a Spirit and at another time was born of a virgin and at another time not so. And he was afterwards continually infused into bodies and was manifested in many people at different times.[28]

Epiphanius moreover states: "They (the Elchasaites) confess Christ in name believing that he was created and that he appears time and again. He was formed for the first time in Adam and he puts off the body of Adam and assumes it again whenever he wished."[29] When one substitutes the supernal "Apostle of Light" for the "Christ" of the patristic witnesses, the connection of the Elchasaite doctrine with its Manichaean analogue is apparent. This concept of the cyclical manifestation of the same heavenly entity in various human forms throughout history is a form of the so-called "true prophet" (ὁ ἀληθὴς προφήτης) doctrine associated with the Pseudo-Clementine literature[30] and with Ebionite Christianity.[31]

Interestingly, Western heresiological sources are largely silent regarding Mani's concept of prophetic succession; instead, it is from Muslim writers that we receive our most abundant documentation regarding the chain of proto-Manichaean prophets. This circumstance may be due to greater Muslim familiarity with the very idea of prophetic succession, since Muhammad espoused and Islam recognized an analogous concept regarding authentic prophetic predecessors and their attendant status.[32] Given this parallel, one might be tempted to assert that Islamicate Manichaeism simply borrowed this doctrine from the dominant religious community in its environment, or at the very least, that the Muslim commentators have projected their own understanding of the prophetic office upon this dualistic sect. Such an argument however cannot stand. As we shall see below, the scheme is already alluded to by Ephrem Syrus in his valuable fourth-century refutation of Manichaean teachings, and it is expressly attested within the Coptic Manichaean texts of the fourth and fifth centuries CE.[33] In fact, it is more than likely that the currents of influence flow in the opposite direction—it was Muhammad who adopted and adapted the concept of the cyclical progression of universal (as well as ethnic) prophets from Manichaeism in order to construct his distinctive history of revelation.[34]

The earliest Muslim testimony which mentions the Manichaean doctrine of the succession of prophets is that of 'Abd al-Jabbār, a tenth-century Mu'tazilite sage who compiled a vast encyclopaedia of theological doctrines (*Kitāb al-Mughnī*)[35] that includes valuable information about 'Abbāsid dualist sects. The information contained therein concerning Manichaeism (as well as the other dualist movements) was apparently derived from Abū Muḥammad al-Ḥasan b. Mūsā al-Nawbakhtī's *Kitāb al-ārā' wa-l-diyānāt*.[36] Near the end of his exposition of Manichaeism, he states the following: "The first to be sent by God for the teaching of knowledge was Adam, then Seth, next Noah. He sent Zoroaster to Persia, the Buddha to India, Jesus the Messiah to the West, (and) lastly Mani, the seal of the prophets."[37] Adam, the first human being according to the biblical and Qur'ānic creation myths, is also the first emissary to proclaim revelatory knowledge. His son Seth assumes the prophetic mantle after Adam's demise, and Seth in turn is succeeded by Noah, the hero of the scriptural Deluge-narratives. After a lengthy temporal hiatus, Zoroaster, Buddha, and Jesus are commissioned to proclaim the message in the geographically (or ethnically?) circumscribed areas of Persia, India (i.e., the "East"), and the West (i.e., "Rome"). The final link in the chain is Mani, who completes and confirms the work of his predecessors.

This is a reasonably clear statement of the idea of the succession of prophets, but 'Abd al-Jabbār gives us no explicit information regarding how Manichaeans understood the relationship of one "link" in the chain to another. Some things can however be inferred from the structure of the list. The roster displays what would appear to be a conscious symmetry. There are seven prophets in all: three who could be termed "ancestral" (Adam, Seth, Noah), followed by three "ethnic" or "geographic" representatives (Zoroaster, Buddha, Jesus), and a single climactic conclusion with the appearance of Mani as "seal of the prophets." The number "seven" thus serves as an ordering principle for a balanced arrangement of authoritative predecessors.[38] This could be an editorial contribution by 'Abd al-Jabbār or his source since, as we shall see, authentic Manichaean writings identify several other figures as predecessors of Mani in the proclamation of his message. Yet the arrangement of the prophets as a group of "seven" also occurs in Manichaean

writings—most importantly, in the roster supplied by the *Codex* itself. Hence we may have here a survival of a Manichaean textual source.[39]

A second informative testimony to consider is that of the eleventh-century Muslim polymath al-Bīrūnī. There we read:

> In the beginning of his book called Shâbûrkân, which he composed for Shâpûr b. Ardashîr, he says: 'Wisdom and deeds[40] have always from time to time been brought to mankind by the messengers of God. So in one age they have been brought by the messenger, called Buddha, to India, in another by Zarâdusht to Persia, in another by Jesus to the West. Thereupon this revelation has come down, this prophecy in this last age through me, Mânî, the messenger of the God of truth to Babylonia.' In his gospel, which he arranged according to the twenty-two letters of the alphabet, he says that he is the Paraclete announced by [the] Messiah, and that he is the seal of the prophets (i.e. the last of them).[41]

This testimony features a valuable quotation excerpted from one of the canonical scriptures reportedly authored by Mani, the *Shābuhragān*.[42] This work was supposedly the only one of Mani's compositions to be written in Persian (as opposed to Aramaic),[43] presumably to facilitate its perusal by Shapur I so as to secure his favor for the expansion of the young religion. The distinctive concept of the periodic revelation ("from time to time") of divine wisdom to humanity via the agency of chosen "prophets" ("messengers of God") is clearly evident in this citation.[44] We also learn the identity of four of these "prophets": Buddha, Zoroaster, Jesus, and Mani, each of whom exercise their missions in designated geographic localities. This coheres with a portion of the earlier testimony of 'Abd al-Jabbār, and given its explicit linkage with a Manichaean scriptural text, strengthens the supposition that the latter (or his source) had access to Manichaean writings. Further, the teachings and instructions associated with each messenger do not vary according to time or place—"*this revelation* has come down, *this prophecy* ... through me, Mani, the messenger of the God of truth to Babylonia." The messengers of God have thus proclaimed a single teaching to humankind, regardless of the circumstances of their own settings or audiences. We finally learn that Mani's mission featured an eschatological component, in that Mani is considered the messenger for "this last age."[45] This lesson is reinforced with al-Bīrūnī's citation from another of Mani's works[46] wherein he declares himself to be the "Paraclete" promised by Jesus and the "seal of the prophets."[47]

A testimony which coincides in part and further extends the evidence of both 'Abd al-Jabbār and al-Bīrūnī is found within the important twelfth-century heresiological catalogue of al-Shahrastānī. This text reads as follows:

> His doctrine regarding the Law and the Prophets was that the first whom God (may He be exalted!) commissioned with knowledge and wisdom was Adam, the father of humanity; then Seth after him; then Noah after him; then Abraham after him, upon them be peace! Then He sent the Buddha to India and Zoroaster to Persia and the Messiah, the Word of God, and His Spirit, to the land of Rome and the West, and Paul after the Messiah to the (same regions). Then the seal of the prophets came to Arabia.[48]

There are some obvious correlations with the previous statements that we have examined. God periodically dispatches select emissaries who are commissioned with "wisdom and knowledge,"[49] or who at least impart a message imbued with such to humankind. Buddha, Zoroaster, and Jesus reappear as important links in the chain of prophetic succession.[50] Yet significant supplemental information is also provided here. Ten generations after the era of Noah, Abraham receives the divine commission. Following the "national" assignments of Buddha, Zoroaster, and Jesus, the Christian apostle Paul also receives recognition as a "true prophet," thus confirming his importance in the transmission of proto-Manichaean doctrine. Remarkably, Muhammad himself assumes the final position in this chain of revelation.[51]

This final claim plainly indicates that the testimony of al-Shahrastānī experienced some distortion and emendation in the process of its transmission.[52] Muhammad could not possibly have been included in an authentic Manichaean roster of the prophetic succession,[53] since Mani was by definition the "seal of the prophets" dispatched for the final age and hence the last link in its prophetic chain. Moreover, from a purely chronological standpoint Mani preceded Muhammad by four centuries! However, when one compares the testimonies of 'Abd al-Jabbār, al-Bīrūnī, and al-Shahrastānī at this juncture, one immediately notices that the name of Mani is missing from al-Shahrastānī's roster. Probably the Manichaean application of the familiar epithet "seal of the prophets" to Mani, evidenced in the earlier reports, either confused or angered certain Muslim tradents, who then substituted Muhammad for Mani at this position of the chain.[54]

More significant however are the names featured at the beginning of the list. Adam, Seth, Noah, and Abraham are of course prominent characters in biblical narrative, and the names of the first three have already been mentioned in the testimony of 'Abd al-Jabbār. However, with the exception of Abraham, no prophetic status is ever ascribed to them by the Bible.[55] Muslim tradition does, it is true, attribute prophetic rank to all of these figures, but that may reflect in turn the stimulative influence of the Manichaean position. In fact, the inclusion of Abraham in al-Shahrastānī's roster is itself highly suspicious given his prominent role in the establishment of Islam,[56] unless he was originally included among the group of "ethnic prophets"; that is, Abraham was sent to the Jews much as Jesus was sent to the West ("Christians"), Zoroaster to Persia ("Zoroastrians"), and Buddha to India ("Buddhists").

Before turning to the Manichaean witnesses for their reconstruction of the prophetic succession, we need to note a passage contained in the so-called *Prose Refutations* of Ephrem the Syrian, the fourth-century Christian exegete, apologist, and poet.[57] Ephrem's citations of and allusions to Manichaean concepts and doctrines are especially valuable in that he was undoubtedly using the original Aramaic versions of Mani's writings and of compositions of his earliest circles of disciples. This means that a careful reading of Ephrem's polemic will often allow us to recover the initial terminology and phrasing associated with Manichaean ideology.[58] Such would appear to be the case in the present example. Although partially damaged,

enough is preserved to confirm its relevance for the present discussion: "And if they should assert out of (misplaced) reverence (?) that there were ancient teachers of (Manichaean) truth—for they say of Egyptian Hermes and of the Greek Plato and of Jesus who appeared in Judaea that 'they were heralds of that Good (Realm) to the world ....'"[59] The passage continues:

> For if it is so that they (ancient teachers of truth) taught these (doctrines) of the Manichaeans, as they allege: if Hermes had knowledge of Primal Man, father of the *ziwane*, and if he had knowledge of the Pillar of Glory and of [the Realm] of Brightness and the Porter and the rest of the others regarding whom Mani taught about and also revered and addressed in prayer; if Plato had knowledge of the Maiden of Light ... [2 words illegible] ... and the Mother of Life, or the battle or the peace ... and if Jesus taught them in Judaea about refining (the Light), and if he taught the worship of those luminaries that Mani worships, the one whom they assert is the Paraclete who would come after three hundred years, and (if) then we discover that their doctrines or those of their adherents agree with one another, or (even) if one of theirs (agrees) with those of Mani, it (their allegation) is defensible. But if there is no agreement, refutation (of their allegation) is obvious.[60]

In this passage we discern a variant form of the "prophetic succession" tradition which we have been studying via the Muslim heresiological testimonies. Ephrem provides us with what is one of its earliest attested formulations. According to the *Edessene Chronicle*, Ephrem died in 373 CE,[61] which would place the composition of the *Prose Refutations* sometime during the mid-fourth century, barely a century removed from the *floruit* of Mani himself. The formal similarity of Ephrem's material to that found in the Muslim sources of half a millennium later cannot be denied. They share, for example, the affirmation made at the conclusion of their identifications of the divinely commissioned predecessors of Mani's "Paraclete" status, an affirmation which strikes one as gratuitous in Ephrem's testimony. This suggests a common dependence upon Manichaean sources that conveyed this doctrine in this particular form; perhaps, as al-Bīrūnī states, Mani's *Gospel*. In fact, the testimonies of Ephrem and al-Bīrūnī are structurally identical, although their rosters of predecessors vary. Note that Ephrem gives a sequence of Hermes Trismegistus,[62] Plato, Jesus, and Mani the Paraclete, whereas al-Bīrūnī has the sequence Buddha, Zoroaster, Jesus, and Mani the Paraclete.[63]

Of signal importance is the terminology employed by Ephrem, which presumably reproduces the language of his Manichaean sources. The authoritative predecessors are designated "heralds (ܒܫܡܐ) of that Good (Realm)"; i.e., messengers of the Realm of Light who announce among humanity the "good news" of the Manichaean gospel. The technical use of this word for such "messengers" gains credence from Ephrem's denigrating reference to the term in another context: "Moreover we will turn and ask *those advocates of error; that is to say, its 'heralds,'* how the sons of Light were cast into the mouth of the sons of Darkness ...."[64] Here the term clearly refers to proclaimers, both past and present, of Manichaean doctrines.[65] Further, the phrase "teacher(s) of truth" (ܡܠܦܢ ܫܪܪܐ) may also indicate

one or more of the same series of authoritative messengers. This last designation, if actually Manichaean, is especially intriguing in that it displays a close philological and conceptual kinship to the title borne by the Qumran personality popularly (but erroneously) termed the "Teacher of Righteousness," the מורה צדק , which would be better rendered "True Teacher," or "Teacher of Truth," as in Ephrem.[66]

The appearance of Hermes Trismegistus and Plato in Ephrem's roster of alleged Manichaean predecessors is not as odd as it might seem at first glance. It is widely recognized that Mani derived some of his basic ideas from Bardaiṣan, a second-century Edessene intellectual who was thoroughly familiar with Hermetic doctrines and Greek philosophy.[67] One of the earliest Western heresiological testimonies, the so-called *Acta Archelai*,[68] asserts that Mani simply plagiarized his teachings from a collection of books which ultimately stemmed from Egypt.[69] Moreover, the legendary tutelage of Plato by Egyptian priests, who were by definition devotees of Hermeticism, justifies his place in this chain of transmission.[70] It seems possible that Ephrem used a Manichaean source that deliberately invoked these luminaries, as opposed to biblical figures or Eastern founders, in an attempt to gain pagan intellectual recognition for the new system. Manichaeism is based upon a "conscious syncretism,"[71] and it would appear that this syncretism did not hesitate to incorporate anything of possible utility for the advancement of its positions. Similarly, Tardieu has argued that the inclusion of Buddha and Zoroaster in the chain cited from the *Shābuhragān* was expressly designed to convey an imperialistic argument to the king. Just as the Sasanian empire was comprised primarily of a union of their adherents, so too Mani's system aimed to fuse these two religions into a larger whole, thus rendering Manichaeism particularly appropriate for recognition as the Sasanian national religion.[72] The inclusion of these pagan saints renders the religion equally attractive to a wide and influential audience in the Graeco-Roman world. The early response, albeit hostile, of Alexander of Lycopolis to Manichaean teachings suggests that literate circles were deliberately courted in Western missions.

When we turn from Ephrem and the Muslim heresiographers to consider the evidence supplied by Manichaean writings themselves, we soon discover that the sequence of prophetic forerunners, particularly its initial components, was considerably more elaborate than either Ephrem or the Muslim sources indicate. The Coptic Manichaean texts recovered from Medinat Madi in Egypt, which probably date from the fourth century CE, identify Adam, Sethel (i.e., Seth), Enosh, Enoch, Noah, and Shem as "apostle(s)" (ἀπόστολος) who preceded Mani in proclaiming the message of the Realm of Light.[73] Zoroaster, Buddha, Jesus, and Paul are also recognized members of this illustrious roster.[74] *Kephalaia* 14.4-6 equates the advent of Mani "in this final generation" with the appearance of the promised Paraclete, a phrasing that is remarkably similar to al-Bīrūnī's citations from Mani's *Shābuhragān* and *Gospel*.

The Middle Iranian Manichaean sources cohere fairly well with the evidence of the Coptic works. One particularly interesting text was published by W.B. Henning in 1934.[75] Designated M 299a, it was part of the hoard of Middle Iranian and Old Turkish manuscripts recovered from Turfan in central Asia by German expeditions during the first two decades of the present century. This text states "and afterwards, from time to time the Holy Spirit also spoke about its greatness through the mouth of the ancestral prophets who are—Shem, Sēm, Enosh, Nicotheus (?) ... and Enoch. For ... [d]emons (?) and was ... [a sower] of the seed of [truth (?)]. As you ...."[76] At least two further names probably occurred between those of Nicotheus and Enoch, but the damaged state of the manuscript precludes their recovery: presumably the names of Adam and Sethel could be restored here without arousing much dissension.[77]

There are several things to observe about this text. The opening lines are reminiscent of the language found in al-Bīrūnī's quotation from the *Shābuhragān*: "Wisdom and deeds (or: knowledge) have always from time to time been brought to mankind by the messengers of God." Here in place of "God" we have "Holy Spirit" (*w'xš ywjdhr*), which as Henning stated should probably be interpreted as a reference to the Light-*Nous*,[78] the entity that commissions the successive Apostles of Light, here termed literally "the prophetic stations" (*pdyšt'n 'hyng'n*).[79] The periodicity of their missions is expressed in both using identical terminology ("from time to time"). But in al-Bīrūnī's testimony there are no primeval forefathers listed—simply the "national" prophets Buddha, Zoroaster, Jesus, and Mani, the messenger (رسول) to Babylonia. Like its Coptic analogues, M 299a transmits an expanded list featuring once again the names of characters found in the early chapters of the biblical book of Genesis; namely, Enosh, Enoch, and Shem. In addition to these three figures, two anomalous entries are included—Sēm, whose name occurs also in two of the Coptic lists and who is apparently identical with Shem b. Noah,[80] and Nicotheus, an otherwise enigmatic personage possessing Jewish-gnostic connections.[81]

One is sorely tempted to see in the Manichaean duplication of Shem/Sēm an allusion to the aggadic identification of Shem with Melchizedek, the mysterious priestly figure of Genesis 14 and Psalm 110.[82] However, the name (and existence of) "Sēm" probably results from a scribal misunderstanding of the peculiarities in transliteration from Semitic scripts to Greek spellings. Apparently some Manichaean tradents considered Semitic שם, שת, שת and Greek Σημ to be two distinct individuals due to the divergent spellings of the name. The confusion must have occurred fairly soon in the process of transmission, since *Homilies* 68.17 already contains both "names" side by side, even though Coptic script possesses separate signs for these sibilants.

We see therefore that authentic Manichaean texts, on the whole, display a remarkable unanimity in their articulated rosters of prophetic "predecessors." They unfailingly accord a prominent position to an initial series of primeval forefathers whose names appear in the Hebrew Bible—this despite the fact that the Bible nowhere credits them with prophetic, or even literary, prowess of any kind. That latter circumstance suggests that the biblical traditions are of miniscule interest and import for nascent Manichaeism, a conclusion reinforced by the heresiological testimonies remarking its disparagement of the Hebrew Bible. Nevertheless, there exist ancient (from Mani's perspective) and persistent traditions transmitted *outside* the biblical canon that attribute both visionary experiences and literary productions to these same forefathers. The bulk of these traditions comprise what modern scholars term "Jewish pseudepigrapha," and it is these works which are of paramount significance for unpacking the "biblical" roots of Manichaeism.

The Cologne Mani Codex *and the Prophetic Succession*

Among the sources utilized by the compiler(s) of the *Codex* is one (leaves 45-72) that consists of a series of extracts from at least five previously unattested pseudepigraphic writings. These works purportedly emanate from the primeval forefathers Adam, Seth, Enosh, Shem, and Enoch—five of the "ancient teachers of truth" repeatedly encountered in the preserved rosters of the authoritative chain of prophets. Joined to their testimonies are citations taken from the writings of the Christian apostle Paul and lastly Mani himself, who is pointedly identified as the promised Paraclete. The structure of this portion of the *Codex* thus formally mirrors several of the lists examined above,[83] save that the former includes representative evidence for the exalted status of each figure in the series, and is furthermore bracketed by introductory and concluding material that cements it within the surrounding narrative context.[84] The lists by contrast simply assert the prophets' identities without providing justificatory evidence for the claim.

The "expanded" nature of the *Codex* passage suggests that this section was deliberately designed as an ἀπολογία for the religious experience and teachings of Mani,[85] both of which receive copious attention in the *Codex*. This entire section (leaves 45-72) was contributed intact by "Baraies the teacher" (Βαραίης ὁ διδάσκαλος),[86] a prominent second-generation Manichaean leader whose name also figures in the heresiological literature.[87] It is he who was doubtless responsible for the final integrity of this piece. However, its rhetoric probably faithfully reflects the same style of argument employed by Mani himself in establishing the credibility of his mission. Baraies says as much in the lines which introduce the section: "Know then, brethren, and understand all these things written herein concerning the way in which this apostleship in this generation was sent, *just as we have been taught from him*."[88] The final clause of this statement suggests that Baraies is explicitly imitating the way that Mani himself talked (or wrote?) about what is here (and elsewhere in the *Codex*) termed the "apostleship" (ἡ ἀποστολή), the obvious Greek reflex of what the other traditions we have examined referred to as "teachers of truth," "heralds," "ancestral prophets," and "messengers."[89]

Baraies now goes on to say:

> Furthermore, let him who is willing hearken and pay attention to how each one of the primeval patriarchs communicated his own revelation to a select (group) whom he chose and gathered together from that generation during which he appeared, and after writing (it down), he left it for future generations. Each (patriarch) revealed (information) about his heavenly journey, and they (i.e., the chosen group) promulgated beyond ... to record and display afterwards, and to laud and extol their teachers and the truth and the hope that was revealed to them. Thus each one spoke and wrote down a memoir recounting what he saw, including (an account) about his heavenly journey, during the period and cycle of his apostleship.[90]

This passage provides an explanation for why Mani and his adherents took such interest in the "primeval patriarchs" and the pseudepigraphic writings ascribed to them. Each patriarch had made a heavenly ascent (ἡ ἁρπαγή) during which they toured the divine realm and were made privy to esoteric knowledge. After returning to earth, they revealed their experiences and issued exhortations based upon the same to a small group of their peers, presumably selected on account of their moral fitness. In addition to promulgating their teachings orally among their disciples, each forefather also prepared a written first-person account of their experiences for future readers. The disciples apparently bore some responsibility for the faithful preservation and transmission of the inscribed testimonies to the later generations.

There are therefore several key credentials for candidacy as a representative of the heavenly Light-*Nous*. At their bare minimum they include an ascent-experience, the formation and supervision of a select community of adherents who cherish the teachings of the adept, and the preparation of a written "memoir" (ὑπομνημάτισμον) that faithfully records the circumstances of the ascent and some indication of the contents of the revelation.[91] From Mani's perspective, traditional figures who met these conditions merited consideration for apostolic status.

As we shall see in the next chapter, Second Temple and Roman era Jewish literature and early Christian pseudepigrapha provide an especially rich harvest of such traditions, a yield that Mani and his community were not adverse to co-opting and adapting to their own ends. "Apocalypses" or "testaments" emanating from pre-Mosaic biblical figures, Jesus of Nazareth, and prominent Christian apostles would have been particularly attractive to a young religious movement that was consciously seeking legitimation within scripturally grounded communities. The typically autobiographical form of these genres creates an aura of credibility. First-person narrative connotes actual experience, and it is the peculiar experience of heavenly ascent that grants prestige to the one so privileged: "For this reason we (Baraies? or the ultimate compilers of the *Codex*?) have transmitted the ascension and the revelation of our forefathers ... for when each of them had ascended, [all those things which he sa]w and heard he recorded and revealed, *and he himself bore witness to his revelation*, and his disciples became the seal of his apostleship."[92] The author bears personal witness to the veracity of what

is recounted, and his success in winning adherents not only adds luster to his reputation, but also vindicates his authority.

We should moreover realize that the standard rhetorical settings of the genres "apocalypse" and "testament" lend themselves rather easily to "sectarian" adaptation. Neither genre was designed or intended for mass appeal.[93] They deliberately, often explicitly, eschew popular dissemination in favor of issuing didactic and exhortatory instruction to small circles or conventicles of disciples—the "sons" of testamentary works, the "elect" of apocalyptic. They thus foreshadow the Manichaean fascination with the motif of selective revelation, where the divine message is first communicated to chosen groups of disciples, and its emphasis upon the careful preservation and transmission of the words of the righteous elders from generation to generation.[94]

Baraies provides quotations from "apocalypses" (ἀποκαλύψεις) attributed to Adam, Seth, Enosh, Enoch, and Shem, ascriptions which place them nominally (at least) in the category of Jewish pseudepigrapha.[95] Each is an autobiographical description of an unsolicited angelophany that leads to a tour of the divine realm and the revelation of supernal secrets. As previously stated, they do not literally reproduce texts which correspond with other previously known writings that are attributed to these same authors. Yet as we shall see in our close analysis of their contents, they do fit within the literary universe of such texts. Comparative analysis of these five apocalypses will show that overall they share a similar formal structure, raising the suspicion that they have been artificially and secondarily fashioned by resourceful redactors who had access to reservoirs of authentic Jewish pseudepigraphic traditions.[96] The purpose of such fabrication and manipulation of textual fragments is clear—to demonstrate that Mani, the Paraclete of truth, is an authentic link in the chain of "apostles."

The assertion that Mani, as well as others in his Mesopotamian environment, knew and used literature and traditions associated with Second Temple and Roman era Jewish groups is not made lightly. Before proceeding with our detailed examination of the pseudepigraphic "apocalypses" contained in the *Codex*, it will behoove us to devote some time to the examination of the literary and intellectual traditions which accumulated around the antediluvian biblical forefathers in the late antique Near Eastern religious milieu. We will also need to speculate concerning the possible avenues of transmission through which Mani and subsequent teachers collected this useful material. Chapter Two shall explore these concerns.

NOTES

[1]The circumstances surrounding its recovery are recounted by A. Henrichs, "The Cologne Mani Codex Reconsidered," *HSCP* 83 (1979) 342-54. For the text of the *Codex* (and much more), see A. Henrichs and L. Koenen, "Ein griechischer Mani-Codex (P. Colon. inv. nr. 4780)," *ZPE* 5 (1970) 97-217; idem, " ... Edition der Seiten 1-72," *ZPE* 19 (1975) 1-85; idem, " ... Edition der Seiten 72,8-99,9," *ZPE* 32 (1978) 87-199; idem, " ... Edition der Seiten 99,10-120," *ZPE* 44 (1981) 201-318; idem, " ... Edition der Seiten 121-192," *ZPE* 48 (1982) 1-59; L. Koenen and C. Römer, *Der Kölner Mani-Kodex: Abbildungen und diplomatischer Text* (Bonn: Habelt, 1985); idem, *Der Kölner Mani-Kodex: Kritische Edition* (Opladen: Westdeutscher Verlag, 1988). A partial English translation (up through 99.9) is *The Cologne Mani Codex (P. Colon. inv. nr. 4780): "Concerning the Origin of his Body"* (SBLTT 15; ed. R. Cameron and A.J. Dewey; Missoula, MT: Scholars Press, 1979).

[2]Initial speculations centered on Oxyrhynchus (Henrichs-Koenen, *ZPE* 5 [1970] 100-103; also J. Ries, *Les études manichéennes: Des controverses de la Réforme aux découvertes du XXe siècle* [Louvain-la-Neuve: Centre d'histoire des religions, 1988] 229), but Lycopolis has now emerged as a more likely candidate for its provenance. See L. Koenen, "Zur Herkunft des Kölner Mani-Codex," *ZPE* 11 (1973) 240-41; Henrichs, *HSCP* 83 (1979) 349; J.K. Coyle, "The Cologne Mani-Codex and Mani's Christian Connections," *Église et théologie* 10 (1979) 182 n.10; I. Gardner, "A Manichaean Liturgical Codex Found at Kellis," *Or* 62 (1993) 32-33.

[3]See L. Koenen, "Manichäische Mission und Klöster in Ägypten," *Das römisch-byzantinische Ägypten: Akten des internationalen Symposions 26.-30. September 1978 in Trier* (Mainz am Rhein: Von Zabern, 1983) 95; G.G. Stroumsa, "The Manichaean Challenge to Egyptian Christianity," *The Roots of Egyptian Christianity* (ed. B.A. Pearson and J.E. Goehring; Philadelphia: Fortress, 1986) 307-19; P. Van Lindt, *The Names of Manichaean Mythological Figures: A Comparative Study on Terminology in the Coptic Sources* (Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz, 1992) 225-31. One of Manichaeism's earliest attested (circa 300 CE?) Western critics is Alexander of Lycopolis, a Middle Platonist intellectual of the early fourth century. For the Greek text of Alexander's refutation, see *Alexandri Lycopolitani: Contra Manichaei opiniones disputatio* (ed. A. Brinkmann; Lipsiae: Teubner, 1895). Valuable studies include P.W. van der Horst and J. Mansfeld, *An Alexandrian Platonist Against Dualism: Alexander of Lycopolis' Treatise "Critique of the Doctrines of Manichaeus"* (Leiden: Brill, 1974); A. Villey, *Alexandre de Lycopolis: Contre la doctrine de Mani* (Paris: Cerf, 1985); G.G. Stroumsa, "Titus of Bostra and Alexander of Lycopolis: A Christian and a Platonic Refutation of Manichaean Dualism," *Neoplatonism and Gnosticism* (ed. R.T. Wallis and J. Bregman; Albany: State University of New York Press, 1992) 337-49.

[4]Henrichs-Koenen, *ZPE* 5 (1970) 100; Koenen, "Manichäische Mission" 93 n.5.

[5]Henrichs-Koenen, *ZPE* 5 (1970) 104-105; R. Köbert, "Orientalische Bemerkungen zum Kölner Mani-Codex," *ZPE* 8 (1971) 243-47; A. Henrichs, "Mani and the Babylonian

Baptists: A Historical Confrontation," *HSCP* 77 (1973) 35-39; idem, *HSCP* 83 (1979) 352-53; A. Böhlig, "Der Synkretismus des Mani," *Synkretismus im syrisch-persischen Kulturgebiet* (ed. A. Dietrich; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1975) 149-50; Koenen, "Manichäische Mission" 94.

[6]H. Pognon, *Inscriptions mandaïtes des coupes de Khouabir* (Paris, 1898; reprinted, Amsterdam: Philo Press, 1979) 125-31 (text); Theodore bar Konai, *Liber Scholiorum* (CSCO scrip. syri, ser. II, t. 66; ed. A. Scher; Paris: Carolus Poussielgue, 1912) 311-18 (text). Translations can be found in Pognon, *Inscriptions* 181-93; R. Reitzenstein and H.H. Schaeder, *Studien zum antike Synkretismus aus Iran und Griechenland* (Leipzig: B.G. Teubner, 1926) 342-47; A.V.W. Jackson, *Researches in Manichaeism* (New York, 1932; reprinted, New York: AMS Press, 1965) 222-54; A. Adam, *Texte zum Manichäismus* (2d ed.; Berlin: Walter de Gruyter & Co., 1969) 15-23; *Die Gnosis III: Der Manichäismus* (ed. J.P. Asmussen and A. Böhlig; Zürich and München: Artemis, 1980) 103-108; R. Hespel and R. Draguet, *Théodore bar Koni: Livre des Scolies (recension de Séert) II. Mimrè VI-XI* (CSCO 432, scrip. syri t. 188; Louvain: Peeters, 1982) 232-37; J.C. Reeves, *Jewish Lore in Manichaean Cosmogony: Studies in the Book of Giants Traditions* (Cincinnati: Hebrew Union College Press, 1992) 189-93.

[7]G. Flügel, *Mani: seine Lehre und seine Schriften* (Leipzig, 1862; reprinted, Osnabrück: Biblio Verlag, 1969) 49-80 (text). Translations are provided by Flügel 83-108; Adam, *Texte*[2] 23-25, 118-28; B. Dodge, *The Fihrist of al-Nadīm* (2 vols.; New York: Columbia University Press, 1970) 2.773-805.

[8]Regarding Elchasai see W. Brandt, *Elchasai: ein Religionsstifter und sein Werk* (Leipzig: J.C. Hinrichs, 1912); idem, "Elkesaites," *ERE* 5.262-69; G. Strecker, "Elkesai," *RAC* 4.1171-86; K. Rudolph, *Antike Baptisten: Zu den Überlieferungen über früh-jüdische und -christliche Taufsekten* (Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1981) 13-17; M. Tardieu, *Le manichéisme* (Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 1981) 9-12; G.P. Luttikhuizen, *The Revelation of Elchasai* (Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr, 1985), concerning which see especially the review of F.S. Jones, *JAC* 30 (1987) 200-209; L. Cirillo, "L'apocalypse d'Elkhasai: son rôle et son importance pour l'histoire du judaisme," *Apocrypha* 1 (1990) 167-79; S.N.C. Lieu, *Manichaeism in the Later Roman Empire and Medieval China* (2d ed.; Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr, 1992) 39-44.

[9]A. Hilgenfeld, "Elxai libri fragmenta collecta, digesta, diiudicata," *Hermae Pastor graece e codicibus Sinaitico et Lipsiensi* ... (2d ed.; Lipsiae: T.O. Weigl, 1881) 229-40; A.F.J. Klijn and G.J. Reinink, *Patristic Evidence for Jewish-Christian Sects* (NovTSup 36; Leiden: Brill, 1973) 54-67, 114-23, 154-61, 194-97. The name of Elchasai (*'lxs'*) has now been discovered in a Parthian text that discusses the early life of Mani. See W. Sundermann, *Mitteliranische manichäische Texte kirchengeschichtlichen Inhalts* (Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1981) 19 line 26. Future references to this work of Sundermann bear the siglum *KG*.

[10]This is the general thesis that emerges from the more specific arguments advanced in Reeves, *Jewish Lore*. Studies which augment the evidence include idem, "The 'Elchasaite' Sanhedrin of the Cologne Mani Codex in Light of Second Temple Jewish Sectarian Sources," *JJS* 42 (1991) 68-91; idem, "An Enochic Motif in Manichaean Tradition," *Manichaica Selecta: Studies Presented to Professor Julien Ries on the Occasion of his Seventieth Birthday* (ed. A. van Tongerloo and S. Giversen; Louvain: International Association of Manichaean Studies, 1991) 295-98; idem, "Utnapishtīm in the Book of Giants?" *JBL* 112 (1993) 110-15; idem, "Jewish Pseudepigrapha in Manichaean Literature: The Influence of the Enochic Library," *Tracing the Threads:*

Studies in the Vitality of Jewish Pseudepigrapha (SBLEJL 6; ed. J.C. Reeves; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1994) 173-203.

[11]K. Rudolph, "Die Bedeutung des Kölner Mani-Codex für die Manichäismusforschung," *Mélanges d'histoire des religions offerts à Henri-Charles Puech* (Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 1974) 472; B. Visotzky, "Rabbinic Randglossen to the Cologne Mani Codex," *ZPE* 52 (1983) 297.

[12]Rudolph, "Bedeutung" 472; Henrichs, *HSCP* 83 (1979) 352 n.16; idem, "Literary Criticism of the Cologne Mani Codex," *The Rediscovery of Gnosticism: Proceedings of the International Conference on Gnosticism at Yale, New Haven, Connecticut, March 28-31, 1978* (2 vols.; ed. B. Layton; Leiden: Brill, 1981) 2.726 n.11. See also Sundermann, *KG* 130-31; idem, "Studien zur kirchengeschichtlichen Literatur der iranischen Manichäer I," *Altorientalische Forschungen* 13 (1986) 73 n.117.

[13]For the identity and location of the quotations from the pseudepigraphic works and the Pauline epistles, see below. The writings of Mani which are quoted are his "Epistle to Edessa" (64.8-65.22) and his "Gospel" (66.4-68.5; 68.6-69.8; 69.9-70.10).

[14]The unusual form of this name will be treated in Chapter Four below.

[15]Adam (48.16-50.7); Sethel (50.8-52.7), Enosh (52.8-55.9), Shem (55.10-58.5), and Enoch (58.6-60.7).

[16]Gal 1:1 (60.18-23); 2 Cor 12:1-5 (61.2-14); Gal 1:11-12 (61.16-22).

[17]The definitive treatment remains that of W. Bauer, *Orthodoxy and Heresy in Earliest Christianity* (ed. R.A. Kraft and G. Krodel; Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1971) 1-43; see also A. von Harnack, *Marcion: The Gospel of the Alien God* (Durham, NC: Labyrinth Press, 1990) 101-103. Some important modifications of Bauer's thesis have been supplied in H. Koester, "*GNOMAI DIAPHOROI*: The Origin and Nature of Diversification in the History of Early Christianity," *HTR* 58 (1965) 279-318, reprinted in J.M. Robinson and H. Koester, *Trajectories Through Early Christianity* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1971) 114-57, esp. 126-43; H.J.W. Drijvers, "Edessa und jüdische Christentum," *VC* 24 (1970) 4-33; idem, "Rechtgläubigkeit und Ketzerei im ältesten syrischen Christentum," *OCA* 197 (1972) 291-308; S. Gero, "With Walter Bauer on the Tigris: Encratite Orthodoxy and Libertine Heresy in Syro-Mesopotamian Christianity," *Nag Hammadi, Gnosticism, and Early Christianity* (ed. C.W. Hedrick and R. Hodgson, Jr.; Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1986) 287-307.

[18]"Que Mani ait connu les doctrines de ses deux prédécesseurs [Marcion and Bardaiṣan], est assuré non seulement par les ressemblances qu'offrent avec celles-ci certaines parties de son système, mais encore par les critiques que ses écrits adressent ... à Marcion" (H.-C. Puech, *Le manichéisme: son fondateur - sa doctrine* [Paris: Civilisations du Sud, 1949] 151). Puech cites M 28 (*APAW* [1904] 95) and *Kephalaia* 221.18-223.16 as examples of anti-Marcionite polemic. According to al-Mas'ūdī, Mani devoted a chapter of his *Treasure of Life* to the teachings of the Marcionites (text *apud* Flügel, *Mani* 357). Note also F.C. Burkitt, "Introductory Essay," *S. Ephraem's Prose Refutations of Mani, Marcion, and Bardaisan* (2 vols.; ed. C.W. Mitchell; London: Williams and Norgate, 1912-21) 2.cxlii-iii; H.H. Schaeder, "Urform und Fortbildungen des manichäischen Systems," *Studien zur orientalischen Religionsgeschichte* (ed. C. Colpe; Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1968) 23-24; A. Böhlig, "Christliche Wurzeln im Manichäismus," *Mysterion und Wahrheit: Gesammelte Beiträge zur spätantiken Religionsgeschichte* (Leiden: Brill, 1968) 202-21, esp. 207-12; Lieu, *Manichaeism*[2] 53-54. Note that according to the tenth-century historian al-Mas'ūdī, Mani was "a disciple of Cerdo" (تلميذ قاردون), whom Irenaeus identified as a follower of Simon Magus and an important intellectual influence upon Marcion (*Adv. haer.* 1.27.1). Text of al-Mas'ūdī cited from *Murūj al-dhahab wa-ma'ādin al-jawhar: Les prairies d'or* (9 vols.; ed. C. Barbier de Meynard and P. de Courteille; Paris: Imprimerie impériale, 1861-77) 2.167.

[19]According to Origen (*apud* Eusebius, *Historia ecclesiastica* 6.38), the Elchasaites "totally reject the Apostle" (τὸν ἀπόστολον τέλεον ἀθετεῖ); i.e., Paul. Mani's Elchasaite brethren pointedly accuse him of wishing to "go to the Greeks" or "to the gentiles." See *CMC* 80.6-18; 87.19-22; 89.9-90.2. Paul was branded as "Greek, child of a Greek mother and Greek father" by the Ebionites (φάσκουσιν αὐτὸν εἶναι Ἕλληνα καὶ Ἑλληνίδος μητρὸς καὶ Ἕλληνος πατρὸς παῖδα [Epiphanius, *Panarion* 30.16.9]).

[20]Garth Fowden perceptively observes that "Mani was a conscious imitator throughout his life of the apostle Paul ..." (*Empire to Commonwealth: Consequences of Monotheism in Late Antiquity* [Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1993] 73). Note H.-C. Puech, "Saint Paul chez les manichéens d'Asie centrale," *Proceedings of the IXth International Congress for the History of Religions, Tokyo and Kyoto 1958* (Tokyo: Maruzen, 1960) 176-87; H.D. Betz, "Paul in the Mani Biography (Codex Manichaicus Coloniensis)," *Codex Manichaicus Coloniensis: Atti del Simposio Internazionale (Rende-Amantea 3-7 settembre 1984)* (ed. L. Cirillo and A. Roselli; Cosenza: Marra Editore, 1986) 215-34. Tardieu offers some particularly cogent remarks regarding Paul's importance in Mani's intellectual development (*Le manichéisme* 25-27).

[21]*CMC* 63.21-23 ([τοῦ πα]ρακλήτου τῆ[ς ἀληθεί]ας); 70.20-22 (διὰ τοῦ πα[ρακλή]του πνεύματος τῆς ἀλη[θείας]). For discussion of this identification, see below.

[22]Titus Bostrensis, *Titi Bostreni contra manichaeos libri quatuor syriace* (ed. P.A. de Lagarde; Berlin: C. Schultze, 1859) 129: ; Syriac text also cited by K. Kessler, *Mani: Forschungen über die manichäische Religion* (Berlin: G. Reimer, 1889) 302. Note also the testimony of Ephrem: "for just as the Jews revile the New Testament, they (the Manichaeans) revile our Old Testament." Text cited from *Prose Refutations* (ed. Mitchell) 1.43 lines 40-44. See also Epiphanius, *Panarion* 66.31.2; 66.74.1 (GCS 37; ed. K. Holl; Leipzig: J.C. Hinrichs, 1933) 69, 114-15; Augustine, *De haeresibus* 46.5: "Deum qui legem per Moysen dedit, et in hebraeis prophetis locutus est, non esse verum Deum, sed unum ex principibus tenebrarum." Text cited from Adam, *Texte*[2] 69 lines 160-62.

[23]So Reeves, *Jewish Lore*; idem, "Jewish Pseudepigrapha"; Tardieu, *Le manichéisme* 43.

[24]The Light-*Nous* or Great *Nous* (Middle Iranian Wahman) is an emanation of Jesus the Splendor, a heavenly entity belonging to the third set of evocations ("the third creation") prompted by the original assault of the forces of Darkness upon the Realm of Light. It is significantly termed "the Father of all the Apostles" (*Kephalaia* 35.22). See Lieu, *Manichaeism*[2] 23. Numerous references to the Light-*Nous* in Manichaean writings have been accumulated by Van Lindt, *Names* 154-69.

[25]See *Kephalaia* 9.24-14.4; 36.3-6; Puech, *Le manichéisme* 61-63, 144-46 (n.241); Reeves, *Jewish Lore* 4 n.3.

[26]Manichaean texts which stress the special status of these three "historical" or "ethnic" prophets include *Kephalaia* 7.18-8.7, 12.14-20; M 42 (Andreas-Henning, *Mir. Man. III* 878-81; M. Boyce, *A Reader in Manichaean Middle Persian and Parthian* [Leiden: Brill, 1975] 170-73; H.-J. Klimkeit, *Gnosis on the Silk Road: Gnostic Texts from*

Central Asia [San Francisco: HarperSanFrancisco, 1993] 124-25); *Kephalaia* (Dublin) 299.2-12. For this last text, see M. Tardieu, "La diffusion du bouddhisme dans l'empire kouchan, l'Iran et la Chine, d'après un kephalaion manichéen inédit," *Studia Iranica* 17 (1988) 163-64.

[27]The epithet "seal of the prophets" (خاتم النبيين), normally associated with the mission of Muhammad, is almost certainly of Manichaean origin and designates the teleological status of Mani within the chain of authentic messengers to humankind. The locution "seal" is frequently employed in Manichaean ideology; e.g., the "Three Seals" (*tria signacula*) of mouth, hands, and heart (i.e., thought); see also *Homilies* 13.27-28. To the references cited by Reeves, *Jewish Lore* 4-5 n.4, add G.G. Stroumsa, "Seal of the Prophets: The Nature of the Manichaean Metaphor," *Jerusalem Studies in Arabic and Islam* 7 (1986) 61-74.

[28]Hippolytus, *Refutatio* 10.29.2: Χριστὸν δὲ ἕνα οὐχ ὁμολογοῦσιν, ἀλλ' εἶναι τὸν μὲν ἄνω ἕνα, αὐτὸν δὲ μεταγγιζόμενον ἐν σώμασι πολλοῖς πολλάκις ... [π]οτὲ μὲν ἐκ τοῦ θεοῦ γεγενῆσθαι, ποτὲ δὲ πνεῦμα γεγονέναι, ποτὲ δὲ ἐκ παρθένου, ποτὲ δὲ οὔ· καὶ τοῦτον δὲ μετέπειτα ἀεὶ ἐν σώμασι μεταγγίζεσθαι καὶ ἐν πολλοῖς κατὰ καιροὺς δείκνυσθαι. Text and translation cited from Klijn-Reinink, *Patristic Evidence* 122-23.

[29]Epiphanius, *Panarion* 53.1.8: Χριστὸν δὲ ὀνόματι ὁμολογοῦσι, κτίσμα αὐτὸν ἡγούμενοι καὶ ἀεί ποτε φαινόμενον. καὶ πρῶτον μὲν πεπλάσθαι αὐτὸν ἐν τῷ Ἀδάμ, ἐκδύεσθαι δὲ αὐτὸν τὸ σῶμα τοῦ Ἀδὰμ καὶ πάλιν ἐνδύεσθαι, ὅτε βούλεται. Text and translation cited from ibid. 196-97. Note the fragmentary incipit that concludes M 363: "Here begins: the coming of Jesus and [his bringing] the religion to Adam and Šitil ...." This latter text is cited from W.B. Henning, "The Book of the Giants," *BSOAS* 11 (1943-46) 71.

[30]Pseudo-Clementine *Homilies* 1.19; 2.4-12; 3.17-28; 11.19; *Recognitions* 1.16, 21; 2.22.4; 8.59-62; 10.51. See W. Bousset, *Hauptprobleme der Gnosis* (Göttingen, 1907; reprinted, Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1973) 171-75; L. Cerfaux, "Le vrai prophète des Clémentines," *RSR* 18 (1928) 143-63; G. Strecker, *Das Judenchristentum in den Pseudoklementinen* (TU 70; 2d ed.; Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1981) 145-53.

[31]Epiphanius attributes the adoption of this type of christology among the Ebionites to the pernicious influence of Elchasai, who purportedly joined their sect. See Epiphanius, *Panarion* 30.3.1-6. Note *CMC* 62.13-14: καὶ τῆς ἀληθείας προφῆται, a clear indication that Manichaeans were conversant with this express concept.

[32]Note Qur'ān 3:30; 4:163ff.; 6:83-86; 19:42-59. See M.P. Roncaglia, "Éléments ébionites et elkésaites dans le Coran: Notes et hypothèses," *Proche-orient chrétien* 21 (1971) 106-110; C. Colpe, "Das Siegel der Propheten," *Orientalia Suecana* 33-35 (1984-86) 72.

[33]This is the standard view regarding the date of the Coptic Manichaean texts. Tardieu however has recently argued that the *Kephalaia* should be dated to the final two decades of the third century; see *Studia Iranica* 17 (1988) 178-79.

[34]So I. Friedlaender, "Jewish-Arabic Studies," *JQR* n.s. 3 (1912-13) 238-39; T. Andrae, *Mohammed: The Man and his Faith* (New York, 1936; reprinted, New York: Harper, 1960) 94-113; G. Widengren, *Muhammad, the Apostle of God, and his Ascension* (Uppsala: A.-B. Lundequistska Bokhandeln, 1955) 7-24, 115-61. J. Fück admits the parallel, but denies that there is "any direct historical connection" between the two; see his "The Originality of the Arabian Prophet," *Studies on Islam* (ed. M.L. Swartz; Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1981) 92.

[35]See S.M. Stern, "'Abd al-Jabbār," *EI*^{2} 1.59-60; G. Monnot, "Les écrits musulmans sur les religions non-bibliques," *Islam et religions* (Paris: Éditions Maisonneuve et Larose, 1986) 65-66.

[36]G. Vajda, "Le témoignage d'al-Māturidī sur la doctrine des manichéens, des daysānites et des marcionites: Note annexe," *Arabica* 13 (1966) 114; Monnot, "Les écrits" 59; idem, *Penseurs musulmans et religions iraniennes: 'Abd al-Jabbār et ses devanciers* (Paris: J. Vrin, 1974) 53-55. For a brief description of the career of al-Nawbakhtī, see Dodge, *Fihrist* 1.441.

[37]Vajda, *Arabica* 13 (1966) 122; Monnot, *Penseurs* 163. This statement is very similar to the one contained in al-Shahrastānī's *Milal*, which we shall examine below. According to Vajda, this indicates that both 'Abd al-Jabbār and al-Shahrastānī relied upon the same source for this portion of their testimonies.

[38]See the remarks of Friedlaender, *JQR* n.s. 3 (1912-13) 253-54. Compare Pseudo-Clementine *Homilies* 17.4.3 (= *Recognitions* 2.47); 18.14.1; *b. Sukk.* 52b *ad* Mic 5:4; *Der. Er. Zuṭ.* 1; *S. 'Olam Rab.* 21.

[39]See the remarks below regarding Ibn al-Murtaḍā's reliance upon a "book of Yazdānbakht." Coincidentally, there is within the *Rasā'il* of the so-called "Brethren of Purity" (Ikhwān al-Ṣafā') an attempt to connect the eschatological concepts of the Mahdī and the "Greatest Paraclete," the former of whom also bears the sobriquet "the Seventh." See the discussion (with references) of I.R. Netton, *Muslim Neoplatonists: An Introduction to the Thought of the Brethren of Purity (Ikhwān al-Ṣafā')* (London: George Allen & Unwin, 1982) 68.

[40]This peculiar syntagm receives some support from the wording of M 5794 I V lines 3-4, wherein we read "... and in *wisdom and deeds* ..." (... *'wd pd whyh 'wd kyrdg'n* ...). However, in light of the parallel expressions found in other sources, perhaps "deeds" (الأعمال) should be emended to "knowledge" (العلم). Compare the testimony of 'Abd al-Jabbār, and that of al-Shahrastānī below, as well as M. Tardieu, "*Al-ḥikma wa-l-'ilm* dans une citation de Mani chez al-Bīrūnī," *AIUON* 41 (1981) 477-81; idem, *Le manichéisme* 20. Note also M 5794 I V lines 10-14: *tswm kw 'yn 'bhwmyšn 'yg dw bwn 'wd nbyg'n zyndg'n whyh 'wd d'nyšn 'y mn 'c h'n 'y pyšyng'n dyn fr'ydr 'wd why hynd* "Fourth, this revelation of mine of (the) Two Principles and (the) living books and *wisdom and knowledge* is greater than the religions of the ancients." Texts from M 5794 cited from Boyce, *Reader* 30. The converse emendation for al-Shahrastānī (from "knowledge" to "deeds") was proposed by Kessler, *Mani* 317 n.1.

[41]al-Bīrūnī, *al-Athār al-bāqiya 'an-il-qurūn al-khāliya* (*Chronologie orientalischer Völker von Albêrûnî* [ed. C.E. Sachau; reprinted, Leipzig: Otto Harrassowitz, 1923] 207.9-14): وزعم فى اوّل كتابه الموسوم بالشابورقان وهو الذى الّفه لشابور بن اردشير أنّ الحكمة والأعمال هى التى لم يزل رسل الله تأتى بها فى زمن دون زمن فكان مجيهم فى بعض القرون على يدى الرسول الذى هو البد الى بلاد الهند وفى بعضها على يدى زرادشت الى ارض فارس وفى بعضها على يدى عيسى الى ارض المغرب ثم نزل هذا الوحى وجآءت هذه النبوة فى هذا القرن الاخير على يدى انا ماتى رسول اله الحقّ الى ارض بابل وذكر فى انجيله الذى وضعه على حروف الابجد الاثنين والعشرين حرفا أنّه الفارقليط الذى بشر به المسيح وأنّه خاتم النبيين . Translation taken from C.E. Sachau, *The Chronology of Ancient Nations* (London: W.H. Allen, 1879) 190.

[42]The *Shābuhragān* is also expressly quoted by 'Abd al-Jabbār and al-Shahrastānī. This work, allegedly dedicated to Shapur I (hence its title), is apparently unknown in this form to Western heresiographers, since it never appears in their lists of the Manichaean canon. Portions of the book probably undergird *Kephalaia* 9.11-16.31 and *Homilies* 7-42. Fragments of the *Shābuhragān* have been identified among the manuscript remains from Turfan. See Boyce, *Reader* 76-81; D.N. MacKenzie, "Mani's

Šābuhragān," *BSOAS* 42 (1979) 500-534; 43 (1980) 288-310; Sundermann, *KG* 92-98; M. Hutter, *Manis kosmogonische Šābuhragān-Texte: Edition, Kommentar und literaturgeschichtliche Einordung der manichäisch-mittelpersischen Handschriften M 98/99 I und M 7980-7984* (Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz, 1992).

[43]Ibn al-Nadīm, *Fihrist* (*apud* Flügel, *Mani* 72.10-11). See Reeves, *Jewish Lore* 33 n.1.

[44]Compare 1QS 8:15-16: היאה מדרש התורה [אשר] צוה ביד מושה לעשות ככול הנגלה עת בעת וכאשר גלו הנביאים ברוח קודשו "this is the study of the Torah [which] He commanded through Moses, in order that they might act in accordance with all that has been revealed from time to time, and likewise with what the prophets revealed by means of His holy spirit."

[45]Compare *Kephalaia* 14.4-6: "From this time the Paraclete, the Spirit of Truth, was sent; the one who has come to you in *this last generation*, as the Savior said ...." Polotsky has pointed out the similarity in his note to this *Kephalaia* text. Interestingly, the authors of the Qumran scrolls sometimes express the belief that they belong to "the final generation" (הדור האחרון); see CD 1:12; 1QpHab 2:7, 7:2; 1Q*14* 18 3 (DJD I, p. 79). Since all of Mani's predecessors proclaimed an identical message despite their diverse cultural settings, one might be justified in considering all of their "teachings" to have some import for the End of Days. This is explicitly so for Enoch who, as we shall see, is one of the prominent prophetic heralds in the Manichaean chain. See *1 Enoch* 1:2b: καὶ οὐκ εἰς τὴν νῦν γενεὰν διενοούμην, ἀλλὰ ἐπὶ πόρρω οὖσαν ἐγὼ λαλῶ "and not for the present generation do I intend (my words), but rather for a distant one do I speak"; the Aramaic *Urtext* (4QEn[a] 1 i 4) preserves only חיק אנה לא על ד]ן דרה להן לד[ר ר]מלל "... not about th]is generation, but rather for a distant generation do I spe[ak]." This passage (1:2b) is an obvious paraphrase of Num 24:17a: אראנו ולא עתה אשורנו ולא קרוב. See also *1 Enoch* 92:1: "Written by Enoch the scribe ... for all my sons who dwell upon the earth and for the last generations who will practice uprightness and peace." The latter translation is that of M.A. Knibb, "1 Enoch," *AOT* (Sparks) 294. Unless otherwise stated, all citations of the Greek versions of *1 Enoch* are taken from *Apocalypsis Henochi Graece* (PVTG 3; ed. M. Black; Leiden: Brill, 1970), and all quotations of the Aramaic text are based upon the edition of J.T. Milik, *The Books of Enoch: Aramaic Fragments of Qumrân Cave 4* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1976).

[46]Identified by al-Bīrūnī as Mani's *Gospel*. Other heresiographers (Epiphanius, al-Ya'qūbī) attest the alphabetical format of this work; see also *Homilies* 94.18-19; *Psalm-Book* 46.20 for references to the twenty-two chapters. Prior to the publication of the *CMC*, a few fragments of the *Gospel* had been recovered from Turfan (M 17, M 172 I). See Boyce, *Reader* 32-33; Henrichs-Koenen, *ZPE* 5 (1970) 192-202. Interestingly, the comments of Baraies that synopsize the Greek citations of the *Gospel* in the *CMC* incorporate both of the claims (Paraclete-status, seal of the apostolate) contained in al-Bīrūnī's résumé; see 70.10-23; 72.4-7.

[47]By claiming the status of Paraclete, Mani takes his place among an illustrious roster of religious teachers who regarded themselves, or were regarded by others, as the fulfillment of Jesus's cryptic promise (John 14:15ff.; 15:26; 16:7) of a future authoritative instructor. Apart from Mani, candidates for Paraclete-status included Paul, Montanus, Sergius (Paulicians), and even Muhammad. See especially Puech, *Le manichéisme* 147 n.250.

[48]al-Shahrastānī, *Kitāb al-milal wa-al-niḥal* (2 vols.; ed. M.S. Kilani; Beirut: Dar el-Marefah, n.d.) 1.248: واعتقاده فى الشراءع والأنبياء أن أول من بعث لله تعالى بالعلم والحكمة آدم أبو البشر ثم بعث شيثا بعده ثم نوحا بعده ثم إبراهيم بعده عليهم الصلاة والسلام ثم بعث بالبددة إلى أرض الهند وزردشت إلى أرض فارس والمسيح كلمة الله وروحه إلى أرض الروم والمغرب وبولس بعد المسيح إليهم ثم يأتى خاتم النبيين إلى أرض العرب.

[49]Assuming the aforementioned suggested emendation of "deeds" to "knowledge" is accepted.

[50]Tardieu considers the inclusion of these figures an illustration of the conscious "universalizing" trajectory of early Manichaeism. Like his Jewish-Christian forebears, Mani rejects the biblical "writing prophets" (including Moses and hence Judaism), but expands the list of authentic predecessors to incorporate representatives from every portion of the late antique οἰκουμένη (*Le manichéisme* 21-23).

[51]Colpe considers the possibility that the phrase as transmitted refers not to Muhammad, but to Mani. See his discussion in *Orientalia Suecana* 33-35 (1984-86) 75-76.

[52]Compare the testimony of the eleventh-century Iranian heresiographer Abu'l-Ma'ālī in his *Bayān al-adyān* (*apud* Kessler, *Mani* 371 lines 12-15): وبرسالت آدم عليه السلام گروند وبرسالت شيث چس برسالت نوح عليهم السلام پس برسالت مردى كه اورا بدوه نام بود بهندوستان ورسالت زردشت بپارس بود ومانى را خاتم النبيين گويند "And they believe in the prophetic status of Adam, upon whom be peace, and then in the prophetic status of Seth and Noah, upon whom be peace; then in the prophetic status of a man who was in Hindustan, named Buddha; and Zoroaster was (of) prophetic status in Persia; and they call Mani 'the seal of the prophets.'" Note too the thirteenth-century sage Ibn al-Murtaḍā in his *Kitāb al-munya wa-l-amal* (*apud* Kessler, *Mani* 349 lines 11-13): وزعم يزدانبخت فى كتابه ان ادم اوّل الانبيا ثم شيث ثم نوح وبعث بالبددة الى الهند وزرادشت الى فارس وعيسى الى الغرب ثم مانى الفرقليط خاتم النبيّين "And Yazdānbakht declares in his book that Adam was the first prophet, then Seth, then Noah, and the Buddha was sent to India, and Zoroaster to Persia, and Jesus to the West; then (finally) Mani the Paraclete, the seal of the prophets." He cites as his authority the "book of Yazdānbakht," presumably that of Abū 'Alī Rajā' b. Yazdānbakht, a leader of the Manichaeans during the caliphate of al-Ma'mūn (813-833 CE). See Ibn al-Nadim, *Fihrist* (*apud* Flügel, *Mani* 79-80); Dodge, *Fihrist* 2.805; A. Abel, "Les sources arabes sur le manichéisme," *Annuaire de l'institut de philologie et d'histoire orientales et slaves (Bruxelles)* 16 (1961-62) 63.

[53]Unless there were later Manichaean sects under 'Abbāsid rule who envisioned a continuing line of prophetic guidance up to their own era, hence accepting "true prophets" after the demise of Mani. A possible analogy from the world of Umayyad Judaism are the 'Īsāwiyya, a Jewish sect who accomodated both Christians and Muslims by including places in their prophetology for Jesus and Muhammad. For a recent thorough treatment of this sect, see S.M. Wasserstrom, "The 'Īsāwiyya Revisited," *Studia Islamica* 75 (1992) 57-80.

[54]"... sans doute remaniement ou interpolation du texte dans un sens favorable à Mahomet" (Puech, *Le manichéisme* 146 n.248). Similarly Friedlaender, *JQR* n.s. 3 (1912-13) 247 n.217; Tardieu, *Le manichéisme* 24; D. Gimaret and G. Monnot, *Shahrastani: Livre des religions et des sectes I* (Leuven: Peeters/UNESCO, 1986) 661 n.42.

[55]Abraham is termed נביא in Gen 20:7. The biblical context suggests that Abraham's "prophetic" status rests upon his close relationship with a deity who has the power to heal Abimelech of his physical afflictions, thus inviting comparison with "wonder-working" prophets like Elijah and Elisha. The only biblical indication that Abraham

was granted insight into heavenly mysteries appears in Gen 15:11-21 during the so-called "covenant of the pieces," particularly in its postbiblical exegesis—see John 8:56; Acts 7:7; 4 Ezra 3:15; *Apoc. Abr.* 11-32. Graeco-Jewish writers tend to attribute Abraham's prophetic powers to his mastery of the Chaldean sciences. For exemplary discussions of this motif, see B.Z. Wacholder, "Pseudo-Eupolemus' Two Greek Fragments on the Life of Abraham," *HUCA* 34 (1963) 101-103; J.E. Bowley, "The Compositions of Abraham," *Tracing the Threads* (ed. Reeves) 226-32. Note also the "testimony" of Berossus provided by Josephus, *Ant.* 1.158: μετὰ δὲ τὸν κατακλυσμὸν δεκάτῃ γενεᾷ παρὰ Χαλδαίοις τις ἦν δίκαιος ἀνὴρ καὶ μέγας *καὶ τὰ οὐράνια ἔμπειρος*.

[56]So Tardieu, *Le manichéisme* 24. However, Augustine provides some evidence that Abraham may have won some positive recognition among Manichaeans; see his *contra Faustum* 19.3.

[57]Long a desideratum, a superlative discussion of the life, works, and influence of Ephrem is now available in E.G. Mathews, Jr. and J.P. Amar, *St. Ephrem the Syrian: Selected Prose Works* (FC 91; ed. K. McVey; Washington, DC: The Catholic University of America Press, 1994) 3-56.

[58]For a fresh collection and annotated discussion of this material, see J.C. Reeves, "Manichaean Citations from the Prose Refutations of Ephrem," *Emerging From the Darkness* (ed. J. BeDuhn, forthcoming).

[59]Ephrem, *Prose Refutations* (ed. Mitchell) 2.208 lines 17-29: ... .

[60]Ephrem, *Prose Refutations* (ed. Mitchell) 2.208-209: ... .

[61]L. Hallier, *Untersuchungen über die Edessenische Chronik* (TU 9.1; Leipzig: J.C. Hinrichs, 1892) 149.

[62]The "Egyptian Hermes" ( ) is a common designation in late antiquity for Hermes Trismegistus, regarding whom see especially G. Fowden, *The Egyptian Hermes: A Historical Approach to the Late Pagan Mind* (Cambridge, 1986; reprinted, Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1993). That the same figure is intended here is confirmed by Ephrem's subsequent allusion to the ; i.e., the κρατήρ or "mixing bowl," a reference to the tractate known now as *Corpus Hermeticum* IV. Curiously, L. Massignon has stated that "pour des manichéens, Hermès était *le premier des cinq précurseurs*, prophètes avant Mani ..." (my emphasis), but apart from Ephrem there are no other witnesses to the heraldic status of Hermes within Manichaeism. Perhaps Massignon counted Hermes as three separate figures (3+1+1) in order to reach this sum. The quotation comes from his "Inventaire de la littérature hermétique arabe," *apud* A.-J. Festugière, *La révélation d'Hermès Trismégiste, I: L'astrologie et les sciences occultes* (2d ed.; reprinted, Paris: Société d'Édition Les Belles Lettres, 1983) 384.

[63]Yet true to Tardieu's observation, the inclusion here of Hermes Trismegistus and Plato illustrates once again the ecumenical thrust of Mani's mission. Hellenistic paganism has no representatives in the Muslim lists; that omission is remedied in Ephrem's list.

[64]Ephrem, *Prose Refutations* (ed. Mitchell) 1.75: ... .

[65]See also *Des heiligen Ephraem des Syrers Hymnen contra Haereses* (CSCO 169, scrip. syri 76; ed. E. Beck; Louvain: L. Durbecq, 1957) 22.14 (pp. 82-83): ... "He was called the Messiah (though falsely); he infused his prophets with a lying spirit, and broke his body for his disciples, *and divided the earth among his heralds*: using the name of our Lord against our Lord. When he learned that he was not being accepted, openly to many he declared himself an Apostle, the Paraclete who just recently manifested. Blessed (be you) who delayed and so trapped him." The partitioning of the earth among the "heralds" could allude to the predecessor "ethnic prophets" (Zoroaster, Jesus, Buddha) as well as the contemporary apostles of Manichaeism. Note that once again Mani's Paraclete-status is mentioned in conjunction with the "heralds." On as a *terminus technicus*, see the important discussion of Widengren, *Muhammad* 61-79.

[66]J.C. Reeves, "The Meaning of *Moreh Ṣedeq* in the Light of 11QTorah," *RevQ* 13 (1988) 289 nn.14-16, 292-93, 295. Note Rashi's introduction to his commentary on Zechariah, curiously overlooked in the discussions of this issue: נבואת זכריה סתומה היא מאוד כי יש בה מראות דומות לחלום הניתן לפתרון ואין אנו יכולים לעמוד על אמיתת פתרונו עד יבא מורה צדק "The prophecy of Zechariah is exceedingly opaque, for there are contained in it dreamlike visions which are given an interpretation, but we are unable to pronounce definitively regarding the interpretation(s) until the advent of a 'true teacher.'" The plausibility of a linkage between the Qumranic "Teacher" and the Jewish-Christian "true prophet" concept (and by implication, that of Manichaeism) is discussed by J.A. Fitzmyer, "The Qumran Scrolls, the Ebionites and Their Literature," *Essays on the Semitic Background of the New Testament* (SBLSBS 5; [Missoula, MT]: Scholars Press, 1974) 460-62.

[67]Ephrem elsewhere terms Bardaiṣan "the teacher of Mani" ( ); see *Prose Refutations* (ed. Mitchell) 1.8 line 5. Regarding the connections between the two, see Burkitt, "Introductory Essay" (*apud* Mitchell 2.cxxiv-cxliii); H.J.W. Drijvers, "Mani und Bardaiṣan: ein Beitrag zur Vorgeschichte des Manichäismus," *Mélanges ... offerts à Henri-Charles Puech* 459-69; B. Aland, "Mani und Bardesanes—Zur Entstehung des manichäischen Systems," *Synkretismus* (ed. Dietrich) 123-43; Lieu, *Manichaeism*^{2} 55-59. For Bardaiṣan's knowledge of Hermetica, see especially H.J.W. Drijvers, "Bardaiṣan of Edessa and the Hermetica: The Aramaic Philosopher and the Philosophy of His Time," *JEOL* 21 (1970) 190-210. Ephrem disputes Bardaiṣan's competence in Platonic philosophy, which suggests that the "Aramaean philosopher," as Bardaiṣan was titled, enjoyed some esteem in this regard.

[68]Hegemonius, *Acta Archelai* (GCS 16; ed. C.H. Beeson; Leipzig: J.C. Hinrichs, 1906).

[69]*Acta Archelai* (ed. Beeson) 62-64; Epiphanius, *Panarion* 66.1.4-3.9. This libelous version of Mani's *vita* enjoyed enormous popularity among later Syriac heresiographers; see the references supplied by Puech, *Le manichéisme* 99-100 n.10.

[70]Diodorus Siculus 1.96-98; Diogenes Laertius 3.6-7; Plutarch, *De Iside et Osiride* 10. For further references, see Fowden, *Hermes* 200.

[71]See Reeves, *Jewish Lore* 1.

[72]Tardieu, *Le manichéisme* 24; idem, *Studia Iranica* 17 (1988) 171; M. Hutter, "Manichaeism in the Early Sasanian Empire," *Numen* 40 (1993) 6-7.

[73]*Kephalaia* 12.9-12 (Sethel, Enosh, Enoch, Sēm); *Kephalaia* (Dublin) 299.23-24 (Adam, Seth, Enosh, Enoch, Noah, Shem [*apud* Tardieu, *Studia Iranica* 17 (1988) 163 n.19]); *Homilies* 68.15-19 (Adam, Enosh, Sēm, Shem, Enoch); *Psalm-Book* 142.3-9 (Adam, Sethel, Enosh, Noah, Shem, Enoch). Note that the latter two rosters invert the genealogical relationship of Enoch and the Noahides, peculiarly mirroring the same sequence found in the *Codex* citations from "apocalypses" of Shem and Enoch. On the Shem/Sēm alternation see below.

[74]Zoroaster (*Kephalaia* 12.17-19; *Kephalaia* [Dublin] 299.2-4; *Homilies* 70.2-17); Buddha (*Kephalaia* 12.15-17; *Kephalaia* [Dublin] 299.4-10; *Homilies* 70.18ff.[?]); Jesus (*Kephalaia* 12.19-13.11; *Kephalaia* [Dublin] 299.11-12; *Homilies* 68 bottom [very fragmentary]; *Psalm-Book* 142.11-16); Paul (*Kephalaia* 13.19-26; *Homilies* 69.26ff.; *Psalm-Book* 142.31-143.3).

[75]"Ein manichäisches Henochbuch," *SPAW* (1934) 27-35.

[76]*'wd ps pd 'w'm 'w'm hm w'xš ywjdhr xwyš wzrgyy pd dhyn 'y pdyšt'n 'hyng'n wy'wrd 'y xwd hynd šyym syym 'nwš nkty'wys d*[...]*l*[..]*'wd hwnwx .d' 'w ..... m*]*'zyndr'n 'wd bwd .....]gr 'w twhm 'y .....]c'wnyt'n 'š*[ ] .....]*rndyh*[ ] *t*[ ]. Text reproduced from Henning, *SPAW* (1934) 27-28.

[77]M 22 lists Sethel, Enosh, Sēm, Shem, and Enoch as prophets. See Henning, *SPAW* (1934) 28 n.7.

[78]For validation of this interpretation, see Van Lindt, *Names* 162-64, 166.

[79]See Henning, *SPAW* (1934) 28 n.1; M. Boyce, *A Word-List of Manichaean Middle Persian and Parthian* (Leiden: Brill, 1977) 70.

[80]Note *Kephalaia* 12.12: " ... [from] Enoch to Sēm, the son of N[oah .... "

[81]Thus Fowden, *Hermes* 120 n.17. An oracle of Nicotheus is quoted in the seventh chapter of the *Untitled Text* of the Bruce Codex; see *The Books of Jeu and the Untitled Text in the Bruce Codex* (NHS 13; ed. C. Schmidt and V. MacDermot; Leiden: Brill, 1978) 233. On Nicotheus, see Bousset, *Hauptprobleme* 189-94; Puech, *Le manichéisme* 151 n.269; G.G. Stroumsa, *Another Seed: Studies in Gnostic Mythology* (NHS 24; Leiden: Brill, 1984) 139-43; Fowden, *Hermes* 202-204; Lieu, *Manichaeism*^{2} 65-66.

[82]*Gen. Rab.* 26.3; *b. Ned.* 32b; *Tg. Yer. I* and *Tg. Ps.-J.* Gen 14:18, along with the traditional commentaries *ad loc.*; *Pirqe R. El.* 27. Interestingly, there also exists some evidence for an assimilation of the figures of Seth and Melchizedek. See G. Vajda, "Melchisédec dans la mythologie ismaélienne," *JA* 234 (1943-45) 173-83; B.A. Pearson, "The Figure of Melchizedek in Gnostic Literature," in idem, *Gnosticism, Judaism, and Egyptian Christianity* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1990) 113-114.

[83]Visotzky (*ZPE* 52 [1983] 297-98) suggests that this section has developed through three distinct stages of redactional activity and identity: first Jewish, then Jewish-Christian, and finally Manichaean. The Jewish work consisted simply of the five patriarchal apocalypses, already arranged in the idiosyncratic order that is retained in the *Codex*. A Jewish-Christian group then took over this source and added Paul (!) to the roster, and the Manichaeans in turn adapted the list to reflect their own ideology. There are manifold problems with this speculative reconstruction. Our preceding analysis has already demonstrated the abundant formal similarities among the rosters of Manichaean predecessor-figures; the *CMC* material shares their essential features. The peculiar position of Enoch (as seemingly postdiluvian) and the significance granted Paul are demonstrably Manichaean features, and demand no pre-Manichaean justification for their presence in the *CMC* chain.

[84]The redactional brackets are *CMC* 45.1-48.15 and 70.10-72.7.

[85]Henrichs-Koenen, *ZPE* 19 (1975) 80-81; Henrichs, *HSCP* 77 (1973) 30; idem, *HSCP* 83 (1979) 340; idem, "Literary Criticism" 731; I. Gruenwald, "Manichaeism and Judaism in Light of the Cologne Mani Codex," *ZPE* 50 (1983) 32-36.

[86]The name of the contributor is actually missing, but the modern editors offer some cogent arguments for this restoration. See Henrichs-Koenen, *ZPE* 19 (1975) 80 n.80; Henrichs, *HSCP* 83 (1979) 354.

[87]See the list of Mani's disciples contained in the ninth-century Byzantine "long adjuration-formula" (*apud* Adam, *Texte*^{2} 101 lines 152-57); the name of Baraies appears in line 157. Note also Henrichs-Koenen, *ZPE* 5 (1970) 110 n.26.

[88]*CMC* 45.1-8: γνῶτε τοίνυν ὦ ἀδελφοί καὶ σύνετε πάντα ταῦτα τὰ ἐνθάδε γραφέντα καὶ περὶ τοῦ τρόπου καθ' ὃν ἀπεστάλη ἥδε ἡ ἀποστολὴ ἡ κατὰ τήνδε τὴν γενεὰν *καθὼς ἐδιδάχθημεν παρ' αὐτοῦ*.

[89]This is the term also used in the Coptic Manichaean literature; see above.

[90]*CMC* 47.1-48.15: ὁ γάρ τοι βουλόμενος ἀκουέτω καὶ προσεχέτω ὡς εἷς ἕκαστος τῶν προγενεστέρων πατέρων τὴν ἰδίαν ἀποκάλυψιν ἔδειξεν τῇ ἑαυτοῦ ἐκλογῇ, ἣν ἐξελέξατο καὶ συνήγαγεν κατ' ἐκείνην τὴν γενεὰν καθ' ἣν ἐφάνη, καὶ γράψας κατέλειψεν τοῖς μεταγενεστέροις. καὶ ὁ μὲν περὶ ἁρπαγῆς αὐτοῦ ἐδήλω[σ]εν, οἱ δὲ ἔξω ὠμίλ[η]σαν ... γράψαι καὶ ἀποδεῖξαι μετέπειτα καὶ ἐγκωμιάσαι καὶ μεγαλῦναι τοὺς διδασκάλους ἑαυτῶν καὶ τὴν ἀλήθειαν καὶ τὴν ἐλπίδα τὴν ἀποκαλυφθεῖσαν αὐτοῖς. οὕτω τοίνυν εἷς ἕκαστος κατὰ τὴν περίοδον καὶ περιφορὰν τῆς ἀποστολῆς αὐτοῦ ὡς ἐθεώρησεν εἶπεν καὶ γέγραφεν πρὸς ὑπομνηματισμὸν ἔτι δὲ καὶ περὶ τῆς ἁρπαγῆς αὐτοῦ. For the importance of this passage, see especially M. Himmelfarb, "Revelation and Rapture: The Transformation of the Visionary in the Ascent Apocalypses," *Mysteries and Revelations: Apocalyptic Studies since the Uppsala Colloquium* (JSPSup 9; ed. J.J. Collins and J.H. Charlesworth; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1991) 79-80; also Reeves, "Jewish Pseudepigrapha" 175-81.

[91]This detail suggests the importance of a "book" as a sign of apostolic status. See Widengren, *Muhammad* 29.

[92]*CMC* 71.6-72.4: τούτου δὲ χάριν ἐδευτερώσαμεν ἀπὸ τῶν προγόνων ἡμῶ[ν] πατέρων τὴν τε ἁρπαγὴν αὐτῶν καὶ ἀποκάλυψιν ἑνὸς ἑκάστου .... ὁπηνίκα γὰρ ἕκα[στος αὐ]τῶν ἡρπάζετο, [ἅπερ ἐθεώ]ρει καὶ ἤκουε [ταῦτα πάντα ἔ]γραφεν καὶ ὑπεδεί[κ]νυεν καὶ αὐτὸς αὐτοῦ [τ]ῆς ἀποκαλύψεως μάρτυς ἐγένετο· οἱ δὲ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ ἐγίγνοντο σφραγὶς αὐτοῦ τῆς ἀποστολῆς.

[93]Here I part company with those who would situate apocalyptic among the popular culture of the time. Apocalyptic is learned "conventicle" literature—featuring intricate intertextual allusions to other works, symbolic and arithmetical riddles, a creative use of ancient Near Eastern mythological and "scientific" lore, and a thinly veiled disparagement of rival groups or circles. I would argue that the same holds true for Second Temple Jewish testamentary literature, for it shares many of these features.

[94]For the overlaps between the separate genres of "testament" and "apocalypse," see especially A.B. Kolenkow, "The Genre Testament and Forecasts of the Future in the Hellenistic Jewish Milieu," *JSJ* 6 (1975) 57-71. Note also idem, "The Literary Genre 'Testament'," *Early Judaism and its Modern Interpreters* (ed. R.A. Kraft and G.W.E. Nickelsburg; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1986) 259-67; M.E. Stone, "Apocalyptic Literature," *Jewish Writings of the Second Temple Period* (CRINT II.2; ed. M.E. Stone; Philadelphia & Assen: Fortress & Van Gorcum, 1984) 418-19.

[95]The term "Jewish pseudepigrapha" can be problematic, given the realization that the survival of much of the former is due to its preservation and transmission by non-Jewish scribes, historians, and communities. See the perspicacious remarks of R.A. Kraft, "The Pseudepigrapha in Christianity," *Tracing the Threads* (ed. Reeves) 55-86.

[96]This possibility has been independently proposed by D. Frankfurter in his "Apocalypses Real and Alleged in the Mani Codex," a paper presented before the Manichaeism Group of the Society of Biblical Literature in November 1995. I thank Professor Frankfurter for sharing with me a copy of his important study, the published version of which is forthcoming in *Numen*.

CHAPTER TWO

THE FOREFATHERS AS AUTHORS IN LATE ANTIQUE AND MEDIEVAL NEAR EASTERN RELIGIOUS TRADITIONS

Biblical literature is totally mute regarding any scribal or literary activity during the period of the primeval forefathers. In fact, the writer's craft is barely mentioned prior to the heydey of the bureaucratically obsessed Achaemenian Empire, a dominion whose vast extent necessitated an increased reliance upon an imperial chancellory and its attendant correspondence and record-keeping for effective governance of the provinces. During this period the scribal office, along with the literature preserved and generated by it, achieves a hitherto unrealized pinnacle of status. The value of the "written word" as a testimony to historical precedent and a guide for contemporary policy invests the archival record, and concomitantly the scribal profession that produces it, with an authority and power that rivals the extemporaneous command of the king. Written literature begins to acquire an aura of prestige that is directly connected to its proven efficacy in the administrative sphere. When questions or disputes arise concerning long-standing issues, the correspondence and decrees of earlier rulers can be consulted in the official archives. Their written format suggests an official, objective status.

It is only a short step from this practical utility of the written document in establishing authority to the employment of the "written word" in order to control the composition and growth of national traditions. Once this step is taken, the notion of a national literary "canon" becomes credible. It would thus appear to be no accident that it is precisely during this period of scribal ascendancy that what comes to be termed the "biblical canon" begins to assume the shape it bears today. Most critics admit that the extant form of the canonical Hebrew Bible is the product of Second Temple scribal activity. While much of the underlying tradition may indeed extend well back into the first half of the first millennium BCE, the selection, editorial arrangement, and even the very wording of the national legends is the result of intensive activity on the part of a number of scribal circles within Judaea and diaspora communities during the postexilic period. Thanks to the recovery of the Qumran scrolls, as well as the evidence of the variant texts of works preserved in the Septuagint, we now know that the Second Temple era was a period of vibrant literary and intellectual ferment within the

Jewish community. The process of collecting and redacting those works which eventually came to be recognized as "sacred scripture" was coupled with (and probably not perceived as being different in kind to) the production and/or collection of a vast host of literary traditions surrounding the heroes of the national legends. Presumably at some point and within some circles these latter works too enjoyed an esteem that approached "sacral" status, prior to their eventual castigation by later generations of the orthodox as "pseudepigrapha."

Despite the prominence of the scribal office during the Second Temple period, and despite their demonstrable involvement in the creation and dissemination of the national traditions, some ambivalent attitudes toward the craft of writing and the lofty status of written literature are evident in the sources. Both the "biblical" and "pseudepigraphic" libraries were produced by scribes, but it is only in the latter collection that the biblical forefathers are imagined as authoring and passing down literature to future generations. There would appear to be some tension between the realization that the prominence of written literature was a fairly recent phenomenon, and the understandable desire to project the performance of a cherished and respected activity into the distant past. At any rate, literary works were produced that freely adapted their protagonists to a scribal model,[1] typically identifying an early forefather as the inventor of the scribal craft.

Literate forefathers presume a literature to be read and preserved. The scribal circles responsible for the creation and production of Israelite literature soon progressed from simply asserting their protagonists' familiarity with letters to producing works allegedly authored by them. Literary works that were formally anonymous came to be ascribed to the great figures of the national legends. The foundational document of Judaism, the Torah, becomes associated with Moses. Early "historical" narratives that recount the post-Conquest and monarchical periods are attributed to renowned worthies like Samuel, Jeremiah, and "the men of Hezekiah." The fame of David's musical talents assures his composition of the Psalter, and Solomon's reputed wisdom finds exemplification in "his" collections of aphorisms and symbolic verse.

However, the process by which the national literature comes to be associated with the major figures of national history does not limit itself to these bounds. Fueled perhaps by the examples of ancient *Erfindern* or even divine scribes in the lores of the surrounding cultures, and linked with the comprehensible desire to assert an antiquity and a coherence for their own national traditions, literacy and authorship come to be situated among the earliest generations of humanity. A particular ideological program begins to emerge which stakes a claim to the primacy of Jewish culture, and of course, Jewish culture-heroes. The broad outlines of the ideology run somewhat as follows.

The first human being, Adam, and his descendants are already literate, and are, moreover, already conversant with many of the distinctive precepts and regulations that will eventually be revealed to Moses at Sinai. Books of exhortation and instruction were produced by the primeval forefathers, but

apart from their authors' immediate families, these works failed to gain a hearing among sinful humanity. Prior to the Deluge, the books were carefully deposited for safekeeping, and then exhumed after the Flood by Shem, Noah's righteous heir. Abraham inherited his ancestors' library, expanded the collection with his own contributions, and passed it along to Isaac, who transmitted it in turn to Jacob, from whom Levi, the founder of the priestly guild, received it. Thanks to the priesthood, who have long been closely associated with the scribal profession in the preservation and dissemination of ancestral wisdom, these works survive and hence can be profitably consulted by contemporary generations for instruction and warning.

This pattern of the revelation, authorship, and faithful transmission of pre-Mosaic sacred literature is demonstrably present in Second Temple era literary productions such as the *Book of Jubilees*[2] and the Slavonic Book of *Enoch*.[3] It is however not limited to these works, as the mounting evidence from the continuing publication of the Qumran scrolls testifies. The popularity of this idea is also illustrated by its subsequent adaptation by the later Christian, gnostic, and Muslim communities to suit their distinctive ideological programs, exemplified respectively by the *Cave of Treasures* cycle, so-called "Sethian" gnostic currents, and the *qiṣaṣ-'anbiya* collections. For our purposes, however, the most relevant analogue to the Jewish pattern is the Manichaean doctrine of the predecessor "heralds." There too the forefathers are depicted as authors of revelatory texts which are passed down from generation to generation; moreover, the contemporary Manichaean community retains possession of these "primal scriptures."[4] Hence the Manichaean esteem for ancient worthies like Adam, Seth, Enosh, Shem, and Enoch, and their ascription to them of written literature, betrays an ultimately Jewish heritage.

Before focusing our attention upon the texts of the five biblical forefathers that are found in the *Codex*, it may prove useful to survey the non-Manichaean evidence regarding literary works that were allegedly authored by these figures. As we have previously mentioned, the *Codex* excerpts do not literally correspond with any of the previously known works that are attributed to these same authors. Nevertheless, they do exhibit certain general affinities to the pseudepigraphic traditions associated with each author, and thus can profitably be subsumed among the other accepted representatives of early pseudepigraphic literature. But this is to anticipate a portion of the argument which will be offered throughout Chapters Three through Seven of the present work.

Books of Adam

The terse biblical narrative recounting the creation of Adam and Eve, their experience in the Garden of Eden, their resultant punishment and expulsion, and the birth of three of their sons offers abundant opportunities for

supplementation and expansion by creative authors. The apostle Paul's typological fabrication of an Adam-Christ nexus contributed considerable impetus to the Christian manufacture of an appropriately proleptic literature. A labyrinthine maze of so-called *Books of Adam and Eve* obligingly flourish, almost all of which display clear signs of a Christian redaction, but some of which may ultimately stem from earlier legends current in the late Second Temple period of Judaism. The most reliable guide for negotiating this literature is M.E. Stone, who has recently provided a very useful survey of the corpus of Adam literature used by Jews and Christians in late antiquity.[5]

Stone arranges the sources under two broad rubrics: (1) primary Adam books, which may very well be of Jewish origin; and (2) secondary Adam literature, all of which are derivative works and probably Christian in provenance. Among the primary Adam books he lists the Greek *Apocalypse of Moses*, which some scholars view as the oldest example of such a text; the Latin *Vita Adam et Evae* and the Slavonic *Vita Adam et Evae*, which parallel the *Apocalypse of Moses* at certain points but also relay much additional material; and the Armenian *Penitence of Adam* and the Georgian *Book of Adam*, works which may, according to Stone, actually reflect the most primitive version of an Adam book.[6] There is also a Coptic fragment that displays some affinities with the Armenian and Georgian Adam books. The secondary Adam literature, which is much more diffuse, includes works like the *Testament of Adam*, the Syriac *Cave of Treasures*, the Ethiopic *Conflict of Adam and Eve with Satan*, and numerous Armenian *Adamschriften*. While Stone is also aware of gnostic and Muslim allusions to "books of Adam," he declines to address these testimonies in any systematic way "since they lead into quite other fields of enquiry."[7]

One possible textual stimulus for the idea that Adam produced literature is found in the first four words of Gen 5:1: זה ספר תולדות אדם "this is the book of the generations of Adam." Ramban notes that this phrase is unlike those that are normally used to relate a genealogical table.[8] The Sages declare that it was a "heavenly book" which God showed to Adam wherein was inscribed the names of the numerous illustrious worthies who would descend from him.[9] This work therefore does not qualify as a pseudepigraphon produced by Adam, nor is there any indication that Adam received a copy of this book to pass on to posterity.

But there are certain strands of Jewish tradition which are less vague about Adam as author. A pregnant biblical phrase, such as Ps 139:16, is widely held to be an utterance of Adam.[10] Similarly the whole of Psalm 92 is sometimes ascribed to Adam.[11] A "Prayer of Adam" (תפלת אדם הראשון) occurs in the introduction to the סודי רזיא (*Secrets of Secrets*) of R. Eleazar b. Judah of Worms,[12] an early thirteenth-century compilation of theological, largely esoteric lore whose initial section was first published in 1701 among the contents of the so-called *Sefer Raziel*.[13] The text of this prayer displays several parallels with motifs found in earlier Adam traditions; e.g., the idea that Adam felt remorse for his transgression to the point that he vocally besought God for forgiveness, or Adam's request that he be granted knowledge about the future deeds of his progeny.[14] In response to Adam's prayer (imagined as continuing for three days), the angel Raziel is dispatched to him bearing a "holy book" containing information about "what will happen to you up to the day of your death, and (what will happen to) all of your progeny who shall arise after you ...."[15] Those who faithfully adhere to the precepts inscribed therein shall also acquire the same esoteric wisdom that is promised Adam. Subsequent beneficiaries of this revelation are Enoch, Noah (who requires a new gift of the book from the angel Raphael), Shem, and Abraham. The *Zohar* is cognizant of a similar tradition.[16] Interestingly a "book of Adam" (ספר אדם), apparently some sort of magical manual, was condemned by the ninth-century Karaite author Daniel al-Qūmisī.[17] The work which provoked his censure was probably a recension of the *Sefer ha-Razim* ("Book of Secrets"), a Gaonic compilation of incantations and sundry esoterica whose roots stretch back to the magical lore of late antiquity. Its modern editor has called attention to both manuscript and literary evidence that identifies *Sefer ha-Razim* as the heavenly book revealed to Adam by the angel Raziel.[18]

An *Apocalypse of Adam* was found among the Nag Hammadi hoard of manuscripts. From a formal standpoint, the work is actually a "testament":[19] Adam recounts the contents of the book to Seth "in the 700th year"; i.e., the 700th year after the birth of Seth, or the year of his death according to Septuagintal chronology.[20] Despite some widely accepted disclaimers, this Coptic work appears to share certain motifs with the identically labelled *CMC* fragment.[21] A mysterious quotation found in *Barn.* 2:10 wears the marginal gloss ψαλμ Ν΄ καὶ ἐν ἀποκαλύψει Ἀδάμ "Psalm 50 and in the apocalypse of Adam,"[22] but the text does not verbally parallel any known Adamic work. However, its emphasis upon the efficacy of contrition and humility in winning God's favor suggests a possible connection with the "repentance of Adam" theme that is rather popular in the Adam books. Moreover, Epiphanius informs us that certain gnostic groups treasured books "which they call revelations of Adam,"[23] from which we can infer that a healthy number of such works were circulating during late antiquity.

Interestingly, one chapter of Mani's *Book of Mysteries* incorporated "the testimony of Adam about Jesus" (شهادة آدم على عيسى),[24] an apparent reference to the so-called "Prophecy" section of the *Testament of Adam*.[25] Therein Adam imparts information about future events (such as the Deluge) to his son Seth, terminating with a detailed prediction about the coming of the Christian Messiah. Seth then faithfully records and preserves his father's words for posterity. The *Testament of Adam* was extremely popular among eastern Christian communities, texts of which are extant in Syriac, Arabic, Ethiopic, and Georgian,[26] and allusions to which occur in a variety of sources that share connections with the Syriac *Cave of Treasures* cycle.[27] In the opinion of its most recent translator, the "Prophecy" section of the *Testament* was originally composed in Syriac sometime during the third century CE.[28] If this assessment is accurate, Mani could have indeed drawn upon and adapted material from this portion of the *Testament* for use in his *Book of Mysteries*.[29]

Books of Seth

The birth of Seth, the son of Adam, is reported in Gen 4:25: וידע אדם עוד את אשתו ותלד בן ותקרא את שמו שת כי שת לי אלהים זרע אחר תחת הבל כי הרגו קין "And Adam knew his wife again, and she bore a son, and named him Seth 'because God has granted me another seed in place of Abel, whom Cain killed.'" Gen 5:3 informs us that Seth, like his father Adam, was created in the image of God, the only forefather subsequent to Adam who is so characterized. Aside from these notices, and apart from the bare mention of his name in genealogical charts, Seth plays no further role in biblical literature.

Seth however enjoys extensive development in extrabiblical traditions, particularly among later Christian and gnostic groups.[30] A tendency to view Seth as the offspring who manages to recover, or at the very least maintain, the glory forfeited by Adam as a result of the latter's transgression of the divine commandment emerges in these circles. Among most exegetes, this understanding expresses itself in an early bifurcation of humanity between the "offspring of Seth," viewed as righteous, practically quasi-divine, and the "descendants of Cain," who bring to full fruition the wicked tendencies visible in their namesake.[31] By virtue of their continued residence in the proximity of Paradise and their sincere desire to pursue righteousness and devotion to God, Seth and his immediate progeny are virtual mirrors of God's presence upon earth. They fulfill, to the greatest possible extent given their circumstances, the original vision of God regarding the place of humanity in the created order. The "descendants of Cain," by contrast, represent the logical development of first Adam's and then Cain's misdeeds: an increasingly depraved community of rebels who are totally alienated from God and his terrestrial representatives. The later descendants of Seth (with the exception of only a very few) eventually succumb to the blandishments of the "daughters of Cain," abandon their previous lifestyle, and join in the general corruption of the earth, an event that is chronicled (according to this interpretive trajectory) in Gen 6:1-4. In order to insure the preservation of the "righteous seed" (personified in Noah and his son Shem), God is forced to bring the Flood, after which the history of humanity begins anew.

Seth therefore becomes an important transitional figure in the mediation of divine wisdom to future generations. Not only was Seth privy to the testimony of Adam regarding his mistakes and to the transcripts of subsequent revelations experienced by his father after his repentance,[32] but as a result of his conscious decision to pursue righteousness, he too was favored with divine intimacy. Numerous "books of Seth" emerge in late antiquity, particularly among gnostic circles, for whom Seth seems to become a type of patron "saint." Since Seth is the progenitor of the "sons of God," he comes to be recognized as the ancestor (both physical and spiritual) of all the later righteous generations,[33] including most importantly the gnostic groups themselves. Irenaeus, Hippolytus, and Epiphanius are familiar

with certain groups whom they term "Sethians." Among these groups Seth is viewed as a heavenly being who repeatedly manifests among fallen humanity in order to call them back to the pristine message of the divine world.[34] This cyclical pattern thus parallels (and is probably ultimately the same as) the doctrine of the periodic mission of the "herald" or "true prophet" found in Manichaeism and Jewish Christianity.

"Books of Seth" were especially popular among gnostic communities. Epiphanius reports that the Borborite gnostics had "many books ... in the name of Seth."[35] The Nag Hammadi library preserves several examples of this genre. There we find works like *The Second Treatise of the Great Seth*, *The Three Steles of Seth*, and *The Gospel of the Egyptians*, all of which are ascribed to Seth's authorship, as well as other works like *The Apocalypse of Adam* and *The Apocryphon of John* which exhibit strong interest in the figure of Seth.[36] Mani's disciples were familiar with a so-called "Prayer of Sethel," a title which bears comparison with the Jewish "Prayer of Adam" discussed previously: "Again the disciples questioned the Apostle (i.e., Mani) and said to him, We [ask] you, O Lord, to clarify for us the saying which [appears in] the Prayer of Sethel, the first-born son of Adam,[37] the one which says 'You are magnificent, ye fourteen great Aeons of [Light].' Tell us, O Lord, the meaning of these fourteen great Aeons of Light."[38] Mani proceeds then to identify the fourteen Aeons[39] with heavenly entities drawn from his own system.

Pseudo-Chrysostom refers to a work bearing the title "Book of Seth" (*scriptura inscripta nomine Seth*) which describes the marvelous star that would herald the birth of Christ.[40] There would appear to be no later Jewish references to works attributed to Seth, although there are indications in Second Temple traditions that such works may have been extant.[41] *2 Enoch* 11:29 is cognizant of at least one Sethian work. An intriguing Qumran fragment (4Q*417*) appears to identify the mysterious ספר הגוי mentioned several times in sectarian literature[42] with a heavenly book that was revealed to Seth and transmitted by him to Enosh: "For the law is etched by God for all [ ] sons of Seth. And the Book of Memory is inscribed before him (God) for those who observe his word. And it (Book of Memory?) is the Vision of the Haguy, as a Book of Memory. And he (Seth?) bequeathed it to Enosh with the people of the spirit ...."[43] Later tradition credits Seth with the discovery and promulgation of astronomical lore,[44] a tradition probably indebted to Josephus, who refers to literary activity by the progeny of Seth as a whole that involves the discovery and publication of astronomical knowledge via the erection of two inscribed pillars (*Ant.* 1.69-71).[45]

Books of Enosh

The only information we have regarding Enosh in the Hebrew Bible is given in Gen 4:26: ולשת גם הוא ילד בן ויקרא את שמו אנוש אז הוחל לקרא בשם יי "And to Seth also was born a son, and he named him Enosh. Then he began to call upon the name of the Lord." Jewish tradition normally traces the origin of

idolatry to Enosh, interpreting the final clause of verse 26 ("then he began to call upon the name of the Lord") to Enosh's misguided application of God's sacred name to material objects; i.e., he "called [material objects] 'God.'" By contrast, later Christian and gnostic traditions view Enosh as the righteous successor of Seth who carefully guarded, preserved, and transmitted the writings and teachings of his forebears.[46] He enjoys perhaps his greatest esteem among the Mandaean sect, where he has been transformed into a heavenly *'uthra*.[47] Occasionally literary works are ascribed to him; for example, the medieval Syriac *Book of the Bee* attributes a series of astrological treatises to Enosh,[48] and a section of the Mandaean *Right Ginzā* bears the title "Mystery and Book of the Great Anōš [i.e., Enosh]."[49] The Armenian historian Moses of Chorene reports that two inscriptions bearing revelatory knowledge were erected by Enosh.[50]

Books of Shem

The significance of Shem derives from his genealogical role as biological and pedagogical fulcrum. Schooled in the wisdom of his ancestral forefathers as a result of his antediluvian upbringing, he survives the Flood to perpetuate the ancient teachings among his own descendants,[51] a line that would ultimately produce Abraham, progenitor of and exemplar for at least three distinct Near Eastern religious communities. Biblical narrative is silent about the didactic possibilities embedded within the figure of Shem, content to establish the genetic linkage with the "Semitic" tribes, but postbiblical Jewish tradition is not as reticent. Perhaps the most popular view is to regard Shem and Melchizedek, an otherwise enigmatic character appearing in Genesis 14, as actually the same individual.[52]

Several works attributed to Shem survive from ancient and medieval tradition. The Nag Hammadi corpus contains a *Paraphrase of Shem*,[53] an apocalypse featuring the heavenly voyage and divine instruction of Shem via the agency of the angel Derdekeas, a name probably derived from Aramaic דרדקא "child."[54] A so-called *Treatise of Shem*, an astrological almanac of a form that is well attested in Coptic and Arabic literature, is found in a fifteenth-century Syriac manuscript.[55] Its most recent translator has attempted to date the work to the first century BCE, but he has won little support for this view.[56] *Jub.* 10:13-14 reports that Noah prepared a medical compendium based upon angelic revelations which he eventually bequeathed to Shem.[57] This same tradition resurfaces during the medieval era under the rubric *Sefer Asaph ha-Rophe*, a medical work which allegedly stems מספר שם בן נח "from the book of Shem b. Noah," which in turn is ultimately traceable to a heavenly book transmitted to Noah on Mount Lubar after the Flood.[58] The tenth-century Karaite Salmon b. Jeroḥam also knows a "book of Shem," perhaps the same one as the preceding medical treatise.[59]

Books of Enoch

A cursory perusal of Jewish, Christian, gnostic, and Muslim literature emanating from the Near East during the first millennium of the Common Era produces a substantial number of citations from or references to "books of Enoch." Interest in the figure of Enoch was apparently stimulated by the cryptic biblical notice recounting his mysterious removal from human society: ויתהלך חנוך את האלהים ואיננו כי לקח אתו אלהים "And Enoch walked with God, and then he was gone, for God took him" (Gen 5:24). A common perception developed wherein Enoch was considered to be an exemplary righteous individual who was transported to heaven and there granted access to divine secrets regarding the governance of the cosmos, the progression of history, and the final judgment of the created order. Judging from the quantity of quotations or allusions to Enochic books, a multitude of these compositions apparently circulated among learned circles during late antiquity well into the medieval period, enjoying wide popularity within diverse religious communities.

Ancient estimates regarding Enoch's literary productivity range from the ninth-century Muslim historian al-Ṭabarī's "thirty scrolls"[60] to the inflated "360 books" (variant "366") of *2 Enoch*.[61] Despite these testimonies to Enoch's prolific pen, only two indubitably Enochic "books" have been recovered to date, and these are conventionally designated *1 Enoch* (Ethiopic Enoch) and *2 Enoch* (Slavonic Enoch). Modern scholars have expended considerable energy in the study and analysis of the two "surviving" books of Enoch. One of their more significant discoveries is the realization that these two books are themselves composite works stemming from earlier collections of Enochic lore.

1 Enoch survives in its entirety only in an Ethiopic translation, for which reason it is sometimes referred to as the Ethiopic Book of Enoch.[62] Fragments of earlier versions have been discovered in Greek,[63] Syriac,[64] Coptic,[65] and Latin,[66] but the most important textual witnesses to the origin and growth of *1 Enoch* were found among the Aramaic manuscripts recovered from Qumran, some of which may date to the third or even fourth century BCE.[67] In its present state (108 chapters), *1 Enoch* consists of a compilation of at least five originally separate compositions that are loosely joined to one another: the Book of the Watchers (6-36), the Similitudes (37-71), the Astronomical Book (72-82), the Book of Dreams (83-90), and the Epistle of Enoch (91-105). Chapters 1-5 presently stand as a redactional preamble to the assembled constituent pieces of *1 Enoch*; they may have originally formed part of a longer eschatological oracle that has since perished.[68] Chapters 106-107 are drawn from a source which was very similar to what is fragmentarily narrated on columns 2-5 of the Qumran *Genesis Apocryphon*: both relate an identical tradition regarding the marvelous birth and infancy of Noah. Chapter 108 ("Another book which

Enoch wrote ...") is a separate eschatological oracle focusing exclusively upon the future wretched state of the wicked and the blessed rewards awaiting the pious. Even within the "classical" five subtitled divisions of the bulk of *1 Enoch*, there are portions which seem to function as self-contained units, such as the so-called "Apocalypse of Weeks" found within the Epistle, or which display a thematic unity, such as R.H. Charles's infamous "Noachic Fragments."[69]

The work designated *2 Enoch* actually survives in two distinct recensions (so-called "short" and "long"), both of which are known only from manuscripts in Old Slavonic, and hence this book is often referred to as the Slavonic Book of Enoch.[70] Although opinion has fluctuated, many scholars today hold that the "short" version represents the older form of the text, and that the "long" version is an expansion incorporating largely Christian interpolations. However, the most recent study of the textual history of *2 Enoch* cautions that some of these "expansions" might preserve genuinely ancient traditions.[71] Despite its present Slavonic form, *2 Enoch* provides clear indications of underlying Greek or even Semitic *Vorlagen*, and most scholars have plausibly argued for a date of composition around the turn of the Common Era in Coele Syria or Egypt.

2 Enoch is distinguished by an intense interest in cosmogonical and cosmological matters, foreshadowing in several respects the contents featured in later Jewish *Hekhalot* literature and classical gnostic cosmogonies.[72] The present contents of the work can be summarized as follows. While Enoch is engaged in nocturnal mourning, two angels appear and summon him to a heavenly voyage. After bidding adieu to his sons Methusaleh and Rigim,[73] Enoch ascends with the angels through the seven heavens (whose contents are described) to the throne-room of God. Upon beholding God, Enoch swoons: Gabriel is sent to strengthen him, and then Michael escorts him into "the Lord's presence." His clothing is removed, his body is anointed, and he receives "glorious garments" which transform his appearance into that of an angelic being: "And I looked at myself, and I was like one of the glorious ones, and there was no apparent difference" (*2 Enoch* 9:19).[74]

The angel Vreveil (Uriel?)[75] is now commanded by God to produce the heavenly library, from which Enoch receives a thirty-day intensive lesson in various secrets of the cosmos such as the motion of the heavenly bodies, time-reckoning, and the lyrics of the angelic songs of praise. A second thirty-day period is spent transcribing this information, resulting in the production of 360 (variant: 366) "books." After a final interview with God, wherein Enoch learns the mechanics of God's creative performance, he is bidden to return to earth for a final thirty days during which he should teach his sons "everything you have heard from me." At the end of that session,

> I will send the angels for you, and they will take you from the earth and from your sons to me. For a place is prepared for you, and you shall live in my presence for ever and see my secrets; and you shall be my servants' scribe, for you shall write down everything that happens on earth and everything that is done by those who are on earth and in the heavens, and you shall act for me as a witness in the judgement of the great age.[76]

Enoch dutifully returns to earth; his farewell address to his assembled sons occupies the next six chapters (13-18) of the work. As promised, Enoch then ascends to heaven, and the people offer sacrifice at the spot from whence he was taken. Some manuscripts of the work end here, but others append some additional chapters recounting the course of events up to (and in a few cases including) the time of the Flood, focusing particularly upon the marvelous birth and preservation of Melchizedek.

Space does not permit a thorough rehearsal here of the numerous references to or citations from "books of Enoch" in the religious literatures of the Near East.[77] Given the unusual status of Enoch *vis-à-vis* the other named representatives of the biblical antediluvian generations, it is hardly surprising that his role as revealer of supernal mysteries and divinely authorized inscriber of esoteric wisdom has developed in the directions attested in later literatures. While rabbinic literature for the most part ignores Enoch (or in some cases deliberately disparages him), other currents of Jewish tradition report his exaltation and transformation into the angelic prince Metatron,[78] a tradition which displays an obvious affinity with the material in *2 Enoch.* Classical gnostic literature maintains a deafening silence on the subject of Enoch,[79] although the intriguing composition known as *Pistis Sophia* does acknowledge that Enoch authored "two books of Yeu" during his sojourn in Paradise which he deposited for safekeeping on the slopes of Ararat.[80] Among circles versed in pagan lore, Enoch is assimilated to mythological figures such as Atlas,[81] Hermes, and Thoth,[82] an amalgam that eventually produces his identification with Hermes Trismegistus by the Sabians of Ḥarran.[83] In Islam Enoch becomes Idrīs,[84] renowned scribe and devotee of astronomy who contrived successfully to enter Paradise alive.[85]

The criteria that we have isolated for establishing the identity of an authentic "herald"—an ascent experience (or at least an angelophany), the instruction of a chosen community, and the preparation of a written testimony—appear sporadically in the literary works and testimonies identified above. Of primary relevance to our present investigation will be those traditions that invest the forefather with a special revelatory and instructional significance, usually by depicting him as one who has ascended to a heavenly academy or who has received angelic visitors bearing inscribed books of wisdom. Another important element to highlight is the concept of succession; that is, either the literal or symbolic transferal of heraldic status and/or attributes from one individual to another. This can be accomplished through a variety of means: an explicit declaration or conferral of such status, the reception and promulgation of written testimonia prepared by earlier heralds, or even the "accidental" discovery of such testimonia are all attested within those cultural units that accent this motif. Second Temple and Roman era Jewish literature is a rich repository of motifs like these, and develops them in directions that are either ignored or roundly criticized in the beneficiary traditions of Gnosticism, Christianity, and Islam.[86] Conversely, the latter-

named groups each develop distinctive ways of understanding the historical progress of revelation, and it is in the juxtaposition of these rival schemes that their specific religious identity emerges. Nevertheless, the one feature that unites all of the biblically based factions is the preeminent significance granted certain biblical forefathers in the reception and transmission of divine wisdom to contemporary humanity, and it is precisely this element which Manichaeism also exhibits and in turn transmits to subsequent religious movements within the Near East.

Modes of Transmission

One of the most significant results of the publication of the *Cologne Mani Codex* has been the clarification of the religio-historical background of nascent Manichaeism. Thanks to the information supplied by this signal text, we now know that Mani spent his formative years among a southern Mesopotamian branch of the Elchasaite sect, a Jewish-Christian group with certain gnostic affinities that originated in the Transjordan sometime during the final decades of the first century CE.[87] By the time we reach the third century, representatives of this sect had begun to expand beyond their customary haunts among the wilderness regions of Syria and Palestine.[88] Hippolytus reported that a certain Alcibiades, a teacher of Elchasaite lore hailing from Syrian Apamea, had lately appeared in Rome to expound the doctrines there.[89] Similarly, Origen apparently encountered an Elchasaite publicist during his sojourn in Caesarea, and included a brief synopsis of their teachings in a homily on Psalm 82. The homily has since perished, but his summation of Elchasaite doctrine survives by virtue of its quotation within the *Ecclesiastical History* of Eusebius.[90] The *Codex* now attests that the Elchasaite sect had expanded to the east as well, attracting to its fold Pattikios, the father of Mani, who converted to the sect's ways from paganism and who enrolled his son among the membership at the tender age of four years. The sect continued to flourish during the succeeding centuries in its "homeland" and points eastward: Epiphanius speaks of remnants surviving in the Transjordan area of Moab in the late fourth century,[91] John of Damascus locates them around the Dead Sea during the eighth century,[92] Theodore bar Konai situates some in the Arabian Hijaz "by the shore of the Red Sea" in the late eighth century,[93] and Ibn al-Nadīm calls attention to their continued existence in the marshland region of southern Mesopotamia in the tenth century.[94]

It was once a scholarly commonplace to accept a genetic linkage between the Elchasaite sect and the earlier Second Temple Jewish sect termed "Essenes."[95] Certain suggestive similarities in their ritual behaviors, as gleaned from the descriptive accounts of Essene life provided by Josephus and Philo, led some scholars to postulate that the Elchasaite movement was decisively shaped by a post-*Ḥurban* metamorphosis of the Essene sect.[96] This proposed identification was augmented by geographical factors as well.

According to Pliny, a large Essene settlement was located on the western shore of the Dead Sea,[97] roughly the same area where Elchasai reportedly flourished only a few decades later. Schismatics and disaffected sectarian members may have established rival communities in the region, and further growth would have occurred from refugees fleeing the advance of the Tenth Roman Legion during the First Jewish Revolt (66-73 CE). These communities would have provided a receptive audience for the apocalyptic message of an Elchasai.

The discovery of the Qumran scrolls and the subsequent excavation of a settlement site apparently connected with them in approximately the same area pin-pointed by Pliny fueled interest in the scrolls' possible Essene affiliation. In fact, a gradual consensus has emerged among scholars that the Second Temple Jewish group which best fit the profile created by the scrolls was the Essenes.[98] Archaeological investigation of the settlement site determined that the settlement was destroyed by military action in the year 68 CE. The deposit of the scrolls in eleven caves surrounding the site was widely interpreted to be a protective measure taken by community members in order to preserve their literary heritage. Since the scrolls remained in their hiding places until the middle of the twentieth century, scholars argued that the community perished in the ensuing assault, or at least were physically restrained by the bonds of capture and eventual slavery from ever returning to rescue their precious hoard.

Lately the so-called "Essene hypothesis" has come under fire, primarily (but not exclusively) as a result of the publication of new textual fragments which call into question the presumed ideological unity of the scroll corpus.[99] The identification of the site as an "Essene" settlement has been questioned, but given the important testimony of Pliny and some demonstrable correlations between the ancient witnesses and information found in some of the scrolls, it seems difficult to characterize the encampment by any other label. The problem would seem to lie in the assumed ideological integrity of the scrolls. We should perhaps view the scroll literature through a more inclusive set of lenses: the Qumran "library," as it is frequently called, may in fact provide us with a representative sampling of literature emanating from a number of Jewish sects operating in the heady atmosphere of the Second Temple era. The designation "library" may not be far from the truth.[100]

Since the discovery of the Qumran scrolls, few have concerned themselves with the possible fate of the community after the Revolt. Most of the discussion has concentrated, understandably, on situating the authors of the scrolls within their Second Temple cultural context. Nevertheless, there exists evidence that hints at the survival of the Qumran group or, at the very least, of ideological positions or of literature associated with the site during the succeeding centuries.

Prior to the amazing discovery of the Qumran scrolls, perhaps the most significant manuscript find of the modern era was Solomon Schechter's retrieval of the bulk of the Cairo Genizah textual archive at the close of the last century.[101] A treasure trove of written documents that illuminates the daily life of the Jewish community of Fatimid and Ayyubid Egypt, the find

consists of hundreds of thousands of manuscript fragments ranging in date from the tenth to the nineteenth centuries CE. Yet as scholars soon discovered, the Genizah also preserved medieval copies of literary texts that antedated their scriveners by more than a millennium. Among the ancient documents recovered from the Genizah to date are six fragmentary manuscripts of the original Hebrew version of Ben Sira[102] and two leaves of a copy of the Aramaic *Testament of Levi*,[103] a work previously known only from its Christian redaction(s) in the so-called *Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs*. These finds were hailed at the time as sensational, but an even more extraordinary discovery lay ahead. In 1910 Schechter published what he called "Fragments from a Zadokite Work," a set of manuscript leaves representing two different copies of a sectarian manual that described the formation of a "new covenant in the land of Damascus" (6:19).[104] Schechter acutely discerned that the text was not of medieval origin, but apparently much older, and his intelligent analysis received eventual confirmation when fragments of this same composition, now known as the *Damascus Covenant*, were found among the manuscript remains of the Qumran scrolls.[105] Soon the discovery of Qumran exemplars of Ben Sira and the *Testament of Levi* were also announced,[106] a circumstance serving to reduce the idiosyncratic status of the *Damascus Covenant*. Today the conclusion seems inescapable that there existed a "paper trail" that stretched from Second Temple literary, and especially sectarian, circles to Islamicate Jewry.

The means whereby Second Temple compositions such as the *Damascus Covenant* and the *Testament of Levi* survived into the Middle Ages has been variously explained. One current of interpretation posits the continuous, largely subterranean, survival of Qumran-affiliated sectarian cells within classical Judaism until the Gaonic period, when this ideology re-erupted in the guise of Karaism.[107] Proponents of this view point to the undeniable similarity in terminology and cultural critique displayed within the sectarian scrolls and Karaite literature, suggesting that the sectarian perspective persisted as a living tradition at the fringes of Tannaitic and Amoraic formulations and developments. Some support for this position might possibly come from Rabbanite polemic against the Karaite movement. A term of opprobrium frequently wielded against Karaite arguments is the appellative צדוקי ;[108] i.e., "Sadducee," a label which should not be confused with that of the identically-named group featured in the New Testament and Josephus. It is an aspersion whose force depends upon Second Temple and Tannaitic testimonies regarding a series of halakhic disputes with a shadowy group bearing this name. The same group occasionally is termed ביתוסי , "Baytusi," a designation which long ago was brilliantly connected with the name "Essene."[109] According to rabbinic sources, the "Sadducees/Baytusin" are a religious group who are frequently at odds with the Sages with regard to two major problems: 1) the proper determination of festival dates, or, calendrical issues; and 2) the proper maintenance of ritual purity.[110] Both of these topics, interestingly enough, are major focii of a number of Qumran scrolls. It would seem then that in these disputes we possess historical reminiscences of dialogues between Pharisaic exegetes and Qumran adherents.[111]

Perhaps, so the argument runs, the Rabbanites perceptively recognized in the Karaite schism the physical renascence of their centuries-old adversary.

It is however not necessary to postulate the persistent survival of the "Sadducee" sect in order to explain the eruption and spread of Karaism. Scholars have called attention to sporadic notices reporting the discovery of ancient manuscripts within the caves dotting the Judaean wilderness during the first millennium CE. Eusebius, for example, mentions that Origen employed for his *Hexapla* a manuscript of the biblical book of Psalms that had been recovered "at Jericho in a jar during the reign of Antoninus son of Severus," a clear reference to a find predating that of the Qumran discovery.[112] Several centuries later the Nestorian patriarch Timothy of Seleucia speaks of the recent discovery of a large number of manuscripts, both biblical and non-biblical, in a cave near Jericho.[113] These were reportedly transported to Jerusalem for careful study; their eventual fate is unknown. Karaite and Muslim heresiologists are cognizant of a Jewish sect which flourished around the turn of the era whom they termed *Maghārīyya* ("Cave Men"),[114] "so called because their writings were found in a cave."[115] All of these "archaeological" notices would seem to possess some relevance for the twentieth-century Qumran discovery, although it is difficult to integrate and synthesize the various accounts into a consistent sectarian profile. According to this line of reasoning, the formation of the Karaite sect (among others) is directly dependent upon the material stimulation of this seemingly "miraculous" recovery of authentic writings from ancient sages, a motif which is, incidentally, frequently exploited by both biblical pseudepigrapha and Hermetic circles.

However it is to be explained, it is manifestly clear that Second Temple Jewish writings of a sectarian hue remained available among certain groups of Islamicate Jewry,[116] and hence potentially accessible to non-Jewish antiquarians, intellectuals, and religious fanatics, insofar as such writings (or oral reports of them) may have circulated in a convenient vernacular format.[117] However, to judge from the extant manuscript evidence, the number of such texts was relatively small, especially when compared to the rich corpus of Second Temple and Roman era Jewish texts preserved and transmitted among certain Christian communities, particularly within the eastern churches. Our knowledge of the Jewish pseudepigraphic corpus would be much poorer were it not for eastern Christendom's fascination with biblical legendry. For example, the "complete" texts of *1 Enoch* and *Jubilees* survive only in Ethiopic, *2 Enoch* and the *Apocalypse of Abraham* have vanished apart from the Old Slavic traditions, and some of our most important witnesses to the textual traditions behind works like the *Books of Adam and Eve* and the *Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs* occur in Armenian and Georgian. Oftentimes recensions of pseudepigraphic works survive in several versions and linguistic traditions, attesting a lively scribal interest in the transmission and even embellishment of received wisdom.

The retention and use of nominally Jewish writings by Christian, Jewish-Christian, and especially gnostic communities is already well under way by the second century of the Common Era. The author of the New Testament

Epistle of Jude quotes *1 Enoch* as authoritative scripture; the Epistle of *Barnabas* also cites the work approvingly.[118] Justin Martyr and Clement of Alexandria display a broad knowledge of a wide variety of literary traditions—Jewish, Christian, and pagan—and do not seem too concerned about the ultimately non-Christian origin of the bulk of "sacred" literature which they cite in support of their arguments for the veracity of Christianity. By the time we reach the end of the second century, some circumspection is taking place: the compilation of lists of approved (and suspect) literature, such as the Muratorian Canon, attests the growing concern among western Christians at the proliferation and uncritical acceptance of sundry suspect traditions, and writers such as Tertullian and Irenaeus are beginning to exhibit unease in the face of an expanding body of pseudepigraphical narratives. The latter in fact condemns the Marcosian sect for forging "innumerable apocrypha and pseudepigrapha" in order to lead the faithful astray.[119] This negative trend comes increasingly to the fore in the later western Fathers, eventually resulting in the wholesale condemnation of the pseudepigraphic library in the Byzantine list tradition.[120]

Eastern Christianity, particularly those groups unaffected or unimpressed by Ephesian and Chalcedonian determined orthodoxy, does not share this reticence. Jewish (and Christian) pseudepigraphic works continued to be studied and transmitted within Monophysite and Nestorian communities well into the Middle Ages, and in certain cases, on down to the modern era. Moreover, the East also became the home of a variety of gnostic groups, all of which display tantalizing hints of genetic connections with earlier Jewish, Jewish-Christian, and/or pagan currents.[121] As Stephen Gero has observed,

> The self-definition and development of Christianity in the East proceeded in certain respects in a manner quite different from that in the West. In particular, due to an array of special political and cultural conditions, a number of heterodox groups survived or maintained a dominant role in the general area of eastern Syria and Mesopotamia well into late antiquity and the early Middle Ages.[122]

Some of the "heterodox groups" who flourished in the East were not autochthonous movements, but rather migrated there in the hope of escaping the waves of repression that periodically swept the West. An excellent example of such a group is the Mandaean community, 60,000 of whom according to the *Haran Gawaita* fled eastward from "Jerusalem" into "the Median hills, a place where we were free from domination by all other races."[123] While the precise chronology and circumstances of this migration remain obscure, most scholars today agree that Mandaeism displays Palestinian roots.[124] Similarly, the spurious biography of the early life of Mani that is recounted in the fourth-century *Acta Archelai*, and which forms the basis for similar information contained in Epiphanius and subsequent Syriac heresiological reports, alleges that Mani adapted his peculiar doctrines from "four books" previously penned during the era of the apostles by one Scythianus, a wandering Arab student of occult knowledge who partook of the wisdom of Egypt and Judaea, but who then "suddenly departed this life." His erstwhile student Terebinthus took possession of his teacher's books and brought them to Mesopotamia, where he soon suffered a mortal accident. Eventually the "four books" come into the hands of Mani, who "took these books and transcribed them in such a way that he introduced into them much new matter which was simply his own, and which can be compared only to old wives' fables."[125] Despite its slanderous formulation in the present context, scholars have recently discovered that there is a grain of truth in the charge that Mani utilized traditions, even written texts, of ultimately Western provenance.

Ever since the basic study of I. de Beausobre,[126] scholars have speculated that Mani may have relied on one or more "books of Enoch" as a source for some of his distinctive ideas. The spectacular discovery and publication of Coptic and Middle Iranian Manichaean writings finally confirmed those suspicions, but J.T. Milik's subsequent identification and publication of a Qumran *Vorlage* for Mani's *Book of Giants* has demonstrated that the textual linkages between Second Temple Jewish currents and Syro-Mesopotamian heterodoxy, both Jewish and Christian, are much more intimate than previously imagined.[127] As we have seen, there are potentially a variety of ways by which Mani could have had access to the Jewish *Book of Giants*, as well as other texts or traditions of this ilk. But perhaps the most plausible explanation in this particular case, given the present state of the evidence, involves his Elchasaite patrimony.

According to Epiphanius, in the region around the Dead Sea could be found a Jewish sect once termed "Ossaeans" (Ὀσσαίων), a designation exhibiting a striking resemblance to that of the Second Temple era Essenes, particularly when considering that their geographical location is roughly consonant with that of the late first-century report of Pliny. "During the reign of the emperor Trajan, after the advent of the Saviour, these were then joined by one called Elksai, who was a false prophet."[128] Epiphanius goes on to state that this sect is "now called Sampsaeans," and are considered to be "neither Jewish nor Christian."[129] A separate entry for the "Sampsaeans" in *Panarion* 53 repeats much of this information, adding that "the Sampsaeans are now called Elchasaites."[130]

This testimony suggests the construction of one possible scenario for the transmission of Second Temple era Jewish texts to points eastward, eventually reaching Mani in the land of Babylon. Qumran sectarian survivors of the First Revolt regroup in the neighboring wilderness region to become (by the fourth century) what Epiphanius terms the "Ossaean sect," a name which is probably a later reflex of the sobriquet "Essene." They continue to produce, redact, and carefully preserve writings and teachings of the sort that have been recovered from Qumran. Toward the end of the first century, the charismatic figure of Elchasai emerges among them and successfully convinces a significant portion of the group of the veracity of his eschatological message. This represents the genesis of the "Elchasaite" sect appearing within Christian and Muslim heresiographies. As a result of their Jewish sectarian heritage, they also retain the literature produced and revered by their "forefathers." When the Elchasaites, by now tinged with elements extracted from early Christian sects,[131] spread beyond the Dead Sea

region to Syria and ultimately Mesopotamia, the ancestral literature accompanies them. Mani's early education among third-century "Christianized" representatives of the sect[132] doubtless entailed the careful study of the writings of the ancients, among which to judge from the textual echoes were numbered works like *1 Enoch* and the *Book of Giants*. Even after his final break with the sect, he could not completely shed their formative influence. The originally Jewish *Book of Giants*, which he apparently encountered during his Elchasaite apprenticeship, was eventually transformed into a sacred Manichaean scripture.[133] Other older pseudepigraphic works, particularly those associated with the primal forefathers and prominent New Testament apostles, also exerted a profound influence upon the young Mani and were successfully integrated into the conceptual background of nascent Manichaeism. The continued esteem enjoyed by such literature is witnessed by its authoritative invocation in the *Cologne Mani Codex* and in the Coptic Manichaica by the initial generations of Manichaean missionaries.

The popularity of Jewish pseudepigraphic traditions in the late antique and medieval Near East is not solely due to Manichaean efforts—there is ample attestation of similar preservative efforts and distinctive transformations within Babylonian and Iranian Judaism, Ḥarranian paganism, Mandaeism, Syro-Mesopotamian Christianity, and Shī'ī Islam. The ultimate result is a complex "symbiosis"[134] wherein Jewish, Christian, Zoroastrian, gnostic, and pagan currents feed off of and reinforce each other to form strange, hybrid ideological structures whose definitive statements are issued in highly mythologized tractates like *Sefer ha-Bahir* and *Umm al-Kitāb*.[135] The very existence of such texts reinforces the vitality of the transformed traditions within their new environments, not only among the learned, but even at the level of popular culture, as attested in the corpora of incantation texts and magical amulets. Much about the historical development of this transformative process remains highly opaque, but one thing appears reasonably certain: a prime vehicle through which Second Temple pseudepigraphic traditions reached Mesopotamian, Iranian, and even Arabian soil was gnostic, often Manichaean, in character, and the subsequent manipulation of these motifs was governed by principles coherent with this origin.

NOTES

[1]This propensity to endow one or more forefathers with prototypical literacy suggests an origin during the Persian period. Reflecting their rise to prominence in political administration, "scribes," or those who at least engage in activities long associated with the literate professions, begin to play a featured role in Near Eastern literature. A good example of such a hero is the Aramaean sage Ahiqar, and the resultant popularity of the cycle of legends that soon cluster around his name inspires the invention of ethnically coordinated surrogate-Ahiqars—figures like those of biblical Daniel or Greek Aesop. It is surely no coincidence that it is during this same period that Ezra, titled "the proficient scribe of the Law of God," receives the credit for the restoration of the authentic cultus and the recovery of the ancestral traditions after the disastrous experience of the Babylonian exile. And it is not much later that the learned Ben Sira fulsomely pens the praises of the scribal profession.

[2]See, e.g., *Jub.* 12:27: "And he [Abram] took his fathers' books, which were written in Hebrew, and transcribed them and began from then on to study them, and I [the Angel of the Presence] explained to him everything he could not understand; and he studied them during the six rainy months." Translation is that of R.H. Charles and C. Rabin, "Jubilees," *AOT* (Sparks) 49. Note also *Jub.* 7:38; 10:14; 21:10.

[3]See *2 Enoch* 11:25, 27, 29 (short version): "... take the books which you have written ... and go down to earth, and tell your sons all I have said to you, and all you have seen from the lowest heaven right up to my throne .... And give them the books which your hand has written, and they will read them and recognize the creator ... and they will pass on the books your hand has written to their children, and their children to their children, and next-of-kin to next-of-kin, from one generation to another .... For what you have written, and what your fathers Adam and Seth have written, will not be destroyed to the end of time; for I have commanded my angels Arioch and Marioch ... to preserve your fathers' writing, so that it is not destroyed in the flood which is to come ...." Translation is that of A. Pennington, "2 Enoch," *AOT* (Sparks) 341.

[4]M 5794 I V lines 15-17: *pnzwm kw wysp'n nbyg'n whyh 'wd "zynd 'yg pyšyng'n dyn'n k' 'w 'yn dyn 'y mn* ... [remainder lost] "Fifth, all the books, wisdom, and parables of the ancient religions, when this religion of mine ...." Text cited from M. Boyce, *A Reader in Manichaean Middle Persian and Parthian* (Leiden: Brill, 1975) 30. Cf. F.C. Andreas and W.B. Henning, "Mitteliranische Manichaica aus Chinesisch-Turkestan, II," *SPAW* (1933) 296; G. Widengren, *Muḥammad, the Apostle of God, and His Ascension* (Uppsala: A.-B. Lundequistska Bokhandeln, 1955) 59 n.3, 131-32.

[5]M.E. Stone, *A History of the Literature of Adam and Eve* (SBLEJL 3; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1992).

[6]M.E. Stone, "The Fall of Satan and Adam's Penance: Three Notes on *The Books of Adam and Eve*," *JTS* n.s. 44 (1993) 143-56. See also G.A. Anderson, "The Penitence Narrative in the Life of Adam and Eve," *HUCA* 63 (1992) 1-38.

[7]Stone, *History* 122.

[8]ולא אמר ואלה תולדות אדם כאשר יאמר בשאר מקומות .

[9]Note *b. 'Abod. Zar.* 5a: זה ספר תולדות אדם וגו״ וכי ספר היה לו לאדם הראשון מלמד שהראה הקב״ה לאדם הראשון דור דור ודורשיו דור דור וחכמיו דור דור ופרנסיו . See also *b. B. Meṣ.* 85b-86a; *b. Sanh.* 38b. Compare *Gen. Rab.* 24.2: אמר ר״ יודה בר״ סימון עד שאדם מוטל גולם לפני מי שאמר והיה העולם הראה לו דור דור וחכמיו דור דור ושופטיו וספריו ודרשיו ומנהיגיו אמר לו גלמי ראו עיניך גולמה שראו עיניך כבר הם כתובים על ספרו שלאדם וה ספר תולדות אדם (Theodor-Albeck 1.231); *S. 'Olam Rab.* 30; Tanḥuma Buber *Bereshit* §§28, 29, 32; *'Abot R. Nat.* A 31 (Schechter 46a); *Pesiq. R.* 23: [מה] חלמוד לומר ועל ספרך כולם יכחבו איזה זה ספרו של אדם הראשון זה ספר תולדות האדם (Friedmann 115a). See also Stone, *History* 79.

[10]Note the sources cited in the previous note, as well as Rashi to *b. B. Bat.* 14b.

[11]See *Gen. Rab.* 22.13 (Theodor-Albeck 1.220); *Tg. Ket.* Ps 92:1.

[12]See *Bet ha-Midrasch* (= *BHM*) (6 vols.; ed. A. Jellinek; reprinted, Jerusalem: Bamberger & Wahrmann, 1938) 3.xxxii; G. Scholem, *Major Trends in Jewish Mysticism* (3d ed.; reprinted, New York: Schocken, 1978) 373 n.66; J. Dan, "Eleazar ben Judah of Worms," *EncJud* 6.592-94; Stone, *History* 117. Eleazar's סודי רזיא also alludes to a "book of Adam" when recounting the names of the angels appointed over the months of the year: כי כל המלאכים נקראים על שם אשר ממונים כגון רזיאל שמסר ספר הרזים רזי שכל לאדם הראשון ובו מלאכים על החדשים ... (*Sefer Raziel* [editio princeps] 21b). Text cited from *Sefer ha-Razim: A Newly Recovered Book of Magic from the Talmudic Period* (ed. M. Margalioth; Jerusalem: American Academy for Jewish Research, 1966) 32 n.20. For further information on סודי רזיא, see ibid. 42-44.

[13]For discussion of this work, see *Sefer ha-Razim* (ed. Margalioth) 44-46.

[14]For the text of the "Prayer of Adam," see *BHM* 3.156-57; or one of the numerous reprints of *Sefer Raziel ha-Mal'ak*. The title page of the edition which I have before me (Calcutta, 1895) begins דא ספרא דאדם קדמאה שנתן לו רזיאל המלאך "This is the book of Adam, which Raziel the angel gave to him"; the text of the prayer is on pp. 7b-8a.

[15]... מה יקראך עד יום מותך וכל אדם מבניך שיעמוד תחתיך ... (*Sefer Raziel*, op. cit. 8a).

[16]*Bereshit* 55b: דכד הוה אדם בגנתא דעדן נחית ליה הקב״ה ספרא על ידא דרזיאל מלאכא קדיש״ ממנ״ על רזי עלאין קדישין וביה גליפין גלופי עלאין וחכמה קדישא ושבעין וחרין זיני דחכמת״ הוו מתפרשין מניה לשית מאה ושבעין גליפין דרזי עלאי וכו״ . See *Sefer ha-Razim* (ed. Margalioth) 31 n.17; L. Ginzberg, *The Legends of the Jews* (7 vols.; Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society, 1909-38) 5.117-18, 177.

[17]He names this work in conjunction with some other magical texts at several places in his פתרון שנים עשר ; viz., *ad* Hos 3:4; Mic 5:11; Mal 3:5. See *Commentarius in librum duodecim prophetarium quem composuit Daniel al-Ḳūmissi* (ed. I. Markon; Jerusalem: Mekitze Nirdamim, 1957). See also J. Mann, *Texts and Studies in Jewish History and Literature* (2 vols.; Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society, 1931-35) 2.76 line 2, 79 line 5, 81 lines 1-2; cf. also 82 line 1; *Sefer ha-Razim* (ed. Margalioth) xi-xii, 36; G. Scholem, *Origins of the Kabbalah* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1987) 106-107; S.M. Wasserstrom, "The Magical Texts in the Cairo Genizah," *Genizah Research After Ninety Years: The Case of Judaeo-Arabic* (ed. J. Blau and S.C. Reif; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992) 164.

[18]Ms. Adler JTS: זה ספר רזי חכמה שגלה לאדם מפי רזיאל המלאך בשנת שלש מאות לחיי ירד בן מהללאל בן קינן בן אנוש בן שת בן אדם (*Sefer ha-Razim* [ed. Margalioth] xii, and esp. 58-59; he also notes a similar passage in the Kabbalistic treatise *Even Shoham*); Ms. Oxford 1345 234b: אתחיל ספר הרזים זה ספר הרזים ורזי הכל שניתן לאדם הראשון בעת שנתחנן לפני הגבורה בשעה שחטא ואכל מפרי עץ הדעת והושפל גבורתו והבין בעצמו כי חטא לו ונתן בלבו לבקש תפלו״ ותחנונים בבכי ובחינונים ובעגמת נפש וכך אמר מי אלהי עולם אתה בראת את הכל וגו״ (ibid. 31; note that this proem introduces the תפלת אדם הראשון); *Zohar, Bereshit* 37b: נחתו ליה לאדם הראשון וביה הוה ידע חכמתא עלאה ; *Yitro* 70a: דאתמסר לאדם קדמאה .

[19]P. Perkins, "Apocalypse of Adam: Genre and Function of a Gnostic Apocalypse," *CBQ* 39 (1977) 382-95.

[20]G.G. Stroumsa, *Another Seed: Studies in Gnostic Mythology* (NHS 24; Leiden: Brill, 1984) 82.

[21]See the discussion in Chapter Three below.

[22]*Barn.* 2:10: ἡμῖν οὖν οὕτως λέγει· θυσία τῷ θεῷ καρδία συντετριμμένη, ὀσμὴ εὐωδίας τῷ κυρίῳ καρδία δοξάζουσα τὸν πεπλακότα αὐτήν. While the first part of this quotation is very similar to Ps 51(50):19, the latter clause is extrabiblical. The marginal gloss is found in MS H (Codex Hierosolymitanus), which is dated 1056 CE, but paraphrases of it are attested as early as the second century CE. See M.R. James, "A Fragment of the Apocalypse of Adam in Greek," *Apocrypha Anecdota: A Collection of Thirteen Apocryphal Books and Fragments* (TextsS 2.3; Cambridge: University Press, 1893) 145; *Épître de Barnabé* (SC 172; ed. P. Prigent and R.A. Kraft; Paris: Cerf, 1971) 50, 86-87; Stone, *History* 78.

[23]*Panarion* 26.8.1: ἀποκαλύψεις δὲ τοῦ Ἀδὰμ ἄλλα λέγουσιν.

[24]Ibn al-Nadīm, *Fihrist* (*apud* G. Flügel, *Mani: seine Lehre und seine Schriften* [Leipzig, 1862; reprinted, Osnabrück: Biblio Verlag, 1969] 73.1).

[25]The extant versions of the *Testament of Adam* consist of three distinct sections which were combined under this rubric by a Christian redactor. The first section, "The Hours of the Day and Night," indicates the specific times that constituent creatures of the cosmos utter praise to God. This section was also transmitted as an independent work in Greek; see Cedrenus, *Compendium Historiarum* (CSHB; 2 vols.; ed. I. Bekker; Bonn: Weber, 1838) 1.17-18; James, *Apocrypha Anecdota* 138-45; F. Nau, "Apotelesmata Apollonii Tyanensis," *Patrologia Syriaca* (ed. R. Graffin; Paris: Firmin-Didot, 1894-1926) 2.1363-85. The second section is the "Prophecy" section particularly relevant to the Manichaean material. The third section, "Angelology," identifies and categorizes nine classes of heavenly beings. Some have questioned whether this section belongs within the *Testament* at all; see Stone, *History* 95-96. The most recent translation of the *Testament* is that of S.E. Robinson, *OTP* 1.989-95.

[26]See Stone, *History* 97.

[27]For general overviews, consult A.-M. Denis, *Introduction aux pseudépigraphes grecs d'Ancien Testament* (SVTP 1; Leiden: Brill, 1970) 8-11; Stone, *History* 90-97; D. Bundy, "Pseudepigrapha in Syriac Literature," *Society of Biblical Literature 1991 Seminar Papers* (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1991) 762-65. Note also G.J. Reinink, "Das Problem des Ursprungs des Testamentes Adams," *OCA* 197 (1972) 387-99; S.-M. Ri, "La Caverne des Trésors et le Testament d'Adam," *OCA* 236 (1990) 111-122. A valuable but often overlooked discussion of the complicated transmission of Adam traditions and literature within the Islamicate context is N. Abbott, *Studies in Arabic Literary Papyri I: Historical Texts* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1957) 38-56. As an example of an "allusion" that presumes the *Testament* as background, see P. de Lagarde, *Materialen zur Kritik und Geschichte des Pentateuchs* (2 vols.; Leipzig: B.G. Teubner, 1867) 2.154 lines 28-34: "For on that day Jacob did not eat bread or drink water, and this is like Adam: when he came forth from Paradise, he was sad over the injury (received) from Satan and reflecting upon what was given him due to the violation, and he slept, and Adam did not eat anything, *for believing that he would become a god*, he

(instead) fell from his original dignity. He slept, and he heard from the mouth of God a voice speaking to him, (saying) '(In) a period of five and one-half days I will come (and) deliver you.'" Compare *T. Adam*: ܐܕܡ ܐܕܡ ܐܡܪ ܠܐ ܕܚܠ ܒܥܕܢ ܚܡܫ ... ܐܕܡ ܐܕܡ ܠܐ ܕܚܠ ܕܬܗܘܐ ܐܠܗܐ ... ܐܕܡ ܐܕܡ ܠܐ ܕܚܠ ܕܬܗܘܐ ܐܠܗܐ "Adam, Adam, do not fear! You wished to become a god. I shall make you a god, not now, but after a period of many years." Text of *T. Adam* cited from the edition of M. Kmosko, "Testamentum patris nostri Adam," *Patrologia Syriaca* (ed. Graffin) 2.1342 lines 4-7.

[28]Robinson, *OTP* 1.990; idem, *The Testament of Adam: An Examination of the Syriac and Greek Traditions* (SBLDS 52; Chico, CA: Scholars Press, 1982) 148-51. See also J.H. Charlesworth, *The Pseudepigrapha and Modern Research With a Supplement* (Chico, CA: Scholars Press, 1981) 272.

[29]Mani's *Book of Mysteries* (... βίβλον ... τὴν τῶν μυστηρίων, Coptic *čōme nmmusterion*, Chinese *a-lo-tsan* [= Middle Iranian *rāzān*], سفر الاسرار) is named in practically every extant list of the "official" Manichaean canon; see Reeves, *Jewish Lore* 10-19 for a review of these rosters. Ibn al-Nadīm provides an extensive survey of its component chapter-headings, but gives us no attributed quotations. According to the ninth-century historian al-Ya'qūbī, this work contains Mani's refutations of "the signs of the prophets" (ايات الانبياء). One quotation from the work survives in al-Bīrūnī; see C.E. Sachau, *Alberuni's India* (2 vols.; London, 1888; reprinted London: K. Paul, Trench, Trubner & Co., Ltd., 1910) 1.54-55; A. Adam, *Texte zum Manichäismus* (2d ed.; Berlin: W. de Gruyter, 1969) 9-10.

[30]A convenient compilation of Seth traditions is A.F.J. Klijn, *Seth in Jewish, Christian and Gnostic Literature* (NovTSup 46; Leiden: Brill, 1977).

[31]Note *Pirqe R. El.* 22: רבי ישמעאל אומר משת עלו ונתייחסו כל הבריות וכל דורות הצדיקים ומקין עלו ונתייחסו כל דורות הרשעים הפושעים והמורדים שמרדו במקום. Text cited from the edition of D. Luria (Jerusalem: [s.n.], 1970) 50a-b. Luria (50b) calls attention also to *Zohar, Bereshit* 35b. The same tradition probably lies behind *t. Sanh.* 8.3 (Zuck. 427): אדם נברא יחידי ולמה נברא יחידי בעולם שלא יהו צדיקים אומרין אנו בניו של צדיק ושלא יהו הרשעים אומרין אנו בניו של רשע "Adam was created alone (i.e., as sole ancestor). Why was Adam created alone in the world? In order that the righteous might not claim 'we are descendents of a righteous (ancestor, hence our own righteousness)', and in order that the wicked might not claim 'we are descendents of a wicked (ancestor, hence our genetic predisposition).'" This argument would appear to be directed against those who claimed that Seth and Cain were the ancestors of the righteous and wicked respectively.

[32]See Latin *Vita Adae et Evae* 25:1-29:10. Seth is explicitly responsible for the transcription of the "Prophecy" portion of the *Testament of Adam*: ܐܢܐ ܫܝܬ ܟܬܒܬ ܝܬ ܟܬܒܐ ܗܕܐ "And I Seth transcribed this testament." Text cited from the edition of Kmosko, *Patrologia Syriaca* (ed. Graffin) 2.1343 line 14; cf. also 1351 line 5. Compare the more verbose rendering of the Arabic version: فكتب شيت هذه الوصيه وختمها بخاتم ابيه ادم الذيى كان معه من الفردوس وخاتم حوّا وخاتمه "And Seth transcribed this testament and sealed it with the seal of his father Adam which he had [taken? cf. Ethiopic version] with him from Paradise, and the seal of Eve, and closed it." Text cited from C. Bezold, "Das arabische-äthiopische Testamentum Adami," *Orientalische Studien Theodor Nöldeke zum siebzigsten Geburtstag gewidmet* (2 vols.; Giessen: A. Töpelmann, 1906) 2.906 lines 4-5; cf. also 909 lines 7-9.

[33]This motif is already visible in the so-called "Animal Apocalypse," a portion of *1 Enoch* (85-90) which dates from the mid-second century BCE. There Seth and his "righteous" descendants assume the form of "white bulls," visible images of the form of Adam, who is also represented as a "white bull."

[34]See Epiphanius, *Panarion* 39.3.5: ἀπὸ δὲ τοῦ Σὴθ κατὰ σπέρμα καὶ κατὰ διαδοχὴν γένους ὁ Χριστὸς ἦλθεν αὐτὸς Ἰησοῦς, οὐχὶ κατὰ γένεσιν, ἀλλὰ θαυμαστῶς ἐν τῷ κόσμῳ πεφηνώς, ὅς ἐστιν αὐτὸς ὁ Σήθ ὁ τότε καὶ Χριστὸς νῦν ἐπιφοιτήσας τῷ γένει τῶν ἀνθρώπων, ἀπὸ τῆς μητρὸς ἄνωθεν ἀπεσταλμένος "But the anointed (Christ) itself came as Jesus, a descendant of Seth by descent and by succession of peoples; it was shown forth in the world not through being born but in a mysterious way. This was Seth himself, who both formerly and at that time—as the anointed (Christ)—visited the human race, having been sent from above, from the mother." Translation is that of B. Layton, *The Gnostic Scriptures* (Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1987) 189.

[35]Epiphanius, *Panarion* 26.8.1: ... εἰς ὄνομα τε τοῦ Σὴθ πολλὰ βιβλία ὑποτίθενται. The so-called "Sethians" (*Panarion* 39.5.1) possess "seven books called by the name of Seth" (ἑξ ὀνόματος μὲν Σὴθ ἑπτὰ λέγουσιν εἶναι βίβλοις). So too the Archontic sect employ "books" of Seth and of "his sons" (*Panarion* 40.7.4).

[36]See M. Tardieu, "Les livres mis sous le nom de Seth et les Séthiens de l'hérésiologie," *Gnosis and Gnosticism: Papers read at the Seventh International Conference on Patristic Studies (Oxford, September 8th-13th 1975)* (NHS 8; ed. M. Krause; Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1977) 204-10.

[37]As several have noted, this particular epithet presupposes the classical gnostic understanding of the parentage of Cain and Abel.

[38]*Kephalaia* 42.27-32. This *kephalaion* bears the heading "Regarding the meaning of the fourteen [great] Aeons which Sethel spoke about [in his] prayer."

[39]Note the Naassene version of *Gos. Thom.* 4 that is quoted by Hippolytus, *Refutatio* 5.2.20: "He who seeks me will find me in children from seven years old; for there concealed, I shall in the fourteenth aeon be made manifest." For further references to and discussion of the concept of the "fourteen aeons," see Stroumsa, *Another Seed* 94 n.51.

[40]*Opus imperfectum in Matthaeum*; see *PG* 56.637-38, reproduced and analyzed by J. Bidez and F. Cumont, *Les mages hellénisés* (2 vols.; Paris, 1938; reprinted, New York: Arno Press, 1975) 2.118-20. The eighth-century *Chronicle of Zuqnin* states that "books of Seth" (ܟܬܒ̈ܐ ܕܫܝܬ) had been archived upon a mountain to which the Magi had access; see *Incerti auctoris Chronicon Pseudo-Dionysianum vulgo dictum* (2 vols.; CSCO 91, 104, scrip. syri 43, 53; ed. J.-B. Chabot; Paris: Reipublicae, 1927) 1.58-59, 65-66. Similar traditions appear in Theodore bar Konai and the *Book of the Bee*, although the latter work declares ܗܕܐ ܕܒܟܬܒ̈ܐ ܕܫܝܬ ܠܐ ܡܬܩܒܠ ܒܥܕܬܐ "this (tradition) is not accepted by the Church" (ed. Budge 93 lines 14-15). See W. Bousset, *Hauptprobleme der Gnosis* (Göttingen, 1907; reprinted, Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1973) 378-79; S. Brock, "Jewish Traditions in Syriac Sources," *JJS* 30 (1979) 231; Klijn, *Seth* 55-60.

[41]Sebastian Brock has suggested that the Enochic traditions have been subsequently developed by Jewish tradents in a "Sethite" direction, from which Syrian Christians have freely borrowed and further adapted ("Jewish Traditions" 226-32). Note also the apposite remarks of W. Adler, *Time Immemorial: Archaic History and its Sources in Christian Chronography from Julius Africanus to George Syncellus* (Dumbarton Oaks Studies 26; Washington, DC: Dumbarton Oaks Center for Byzantine Studies, 1989) 104-105.

[42]CD 10:6, 13:2; 1QS 6:7; 1QSa 1:7.

[43]כי חרות מחוקק לאל על כול ע..[ ]. בני שיח וספר זכרון כתוב לפניו לשמרי דברו והואה חזון ההגוי לספר זכרון וימזילה לאנוש עם עם רוח ... . Text cited from *A Preliminary Edition of the Unpublished Dead Sea Scrolls: The Hebrew and Aramaic Texts from Cave Four* (ed. B.Z. Wacholder and M.G. Abegg; Washington, D.C.: Biblical Archaeology Society, 1991-) 2.66 lines 15-16; translation adapted from ibid. xiii.

[44]This is especially the case with the Byzantine chronographers. See J.A. Fabricius, *Codex pseudepigraphus Veteris Testamenti* (2 vols.; Hamburg & Leipzig: Liebezeit, 1713-23) 1.141-52; 2.49-51; Klijn, *Seth* 49-53; Adler, *Time Immemorial* 104-105; 215-16; A.-J. Festugière, *La révélation d'Hermès Trismégiste, I: L'astrologie et les sciences occultes* (2d ed.; reprinted, Paris: Société d'Édition Les Belles Lettres, 1983) 334.

[45]Compare Latin *Vita Adae et Evae* 49-51, where Seth prepares duplicate versions of the testimonies of both Adam and Eve on stone and clay tablets: the former to survive a flood, and the latter to endure conflagration. These writings however do not seem to be astronomical in nature. More *à-propos* is a tradition appearing in Syncellus's introduction to a pseudepigraphic letter that was allegedly addressed by the Egyptian priest Manetho to Ptolemy II Philadelphus, save that the author of the antediluvian inscriptions is "Thoth, the first Hermes." See George Syncellus, *Ecloga Chronographica* (ed. Mosshammer) 40.31-41.19; *Hermetica: The Ancient Greek and Latin Writings Which Contain Religious or Philosophic Teachings Ascribed to Hermes Trismegistus* (4 vols.; ed. W. Scott; Oxford: Clarendon, 1924-36) 3.491-92; B.P. Copenhaver, *Hermetica: The Greek Corpus Hermeticum and the Latin Asclepius in a New English Translation* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992) xv-xvi; G. Fowden, *The Egyptian Hermes: A Historical Approach to the Late Pagan Mind* (Cambridge, 1986; reprinted, Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1993) 29-31; Klijn, *Seth* 124 n.9; Stroumsa, *Another Seed* 137; Adler, *Time Immemorial* 57-65.

[46]The best discussion of the figure of Enosh and his religious significance is S.D. Fraade, *Enosh and His Generation: Pre-Israelite Hero and History in Postbiblical Interpretation* (Chico, CA: Scholars Press, 1984).

[47]See Widengren, *Muhammad* 55-57.

[48]ܐܝܬ ܕܐܡܪ ܕܗܘ ܐܘܠ ܕܟܬܒ ܣܦܪ̈ܐ ܥܠ ܟܘܟܒ̈ܐ ܘܙܝܪ̈ܐ "and some say that he (Enosh) was the first to author books on the courses of the stars and zodiacal signs." Text cited from *The Book of the Bee* (Anecdota Oxoniensia, Semitic Series 1.2; ed. E.A.W. Budge; Oxford: Clarendon, 1886) 29 lines 19-20.

[49]*Right Ginzā* 251.12-282.13 (ed. Lidzbarski); cf. 251.12: *hazin hu raza usidra danuš rba* .... Text cited from the transcription of K. Rudolph, *Theogonie, Kosmogonie und Anthropogonie in den mandäischen Schriften* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1965) 303. Note also *Right Ginzā* 286.13-15 (ed. Lidzbarski): "This speech, this order, and this warning were given us from the earth of light. Anōsh Uthra, the Apostle, brought them and handed them over to the priests." Translation from Widengren, *Muhammad* 57.

[50]Actually the Armenian text is ambiguous as to whether Seth or Enosh was the one responsible for erecting the stelae. See Moses Khorenats'i, *History of the Armenians* (ed. R.W. Thomson; Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1978) 71. Thomson's introduction presumes that the reference is to Enosh (p. 26).

[51]Cf. *Jub.* 12:27; 21:10; *Tg. Ps.-J.* Gen 22:19; *Tg. Ps.-J.* Gen 24:62; *Frg. Tg.* and *Tg. Ps.-J.* Gen 25:22; Rashi *ad* Gen 25:27; *Gen. Rab.* 56.11; 63.10. The rabbinic sources characterize this instruction as "academic": ביה מדרשא דשם רבא.

[52]*Gen. Rab.* 26.3; *b. Ned.* 32b; *Frg. Tg.* and *Tg. Ps.-J.* Gen 14:18, along with traditional commentaries *ad loc.*; *Pirqe R. El.* 27. See also Ginzburg, *Legends* 5.225-26; J. Doresse, *The Secret Books of the Egyptian Gnostics* (New York, 1960; reprinted, Rochester, VT: Inner Traditions, 1986) 154-55.

[53]Hippolytus (*Refutatio* 5.22) appeals to a so-called *Paraphrase of Seth* as crucial for gaining knowledge about the tenets of Sethian gnosticism, and the striking coincidence in title has prompted some scholars to wonder whether Hippolytus has erred in this citation. For an examination of this possibility, see D.A. Bertrand, "«Paraphrase de Sem» et «Paraphrase de Seth»," *Les textes de Nag Hammadi: Colloque du Centre d'Histoire des Religions (Strasbourg, 23-25 octobre 1974)* (NHS 7; ed. J.-É Ménard; Leiden: Brill, 1975) 146-57.

[54]Stroumsa, *Another Seed* 79; K. Rudolph, *Gnosis: The Nature and History of Gnosticism* (San Francisco: Harper & Row, 1983) 131.

[55]John Rylands Syriac 44. See A. Mingana, "Some Early Judaeo-Christian Documents in the John Rylands University Library: Syriac Texts," *BJRL* 4 (1917-18) 59-118.

[56]J.H. Charlesworth, "Rylands Syriac Ms. 44 and a New Addition to the Pseudepigrapha: The Treatise of Shem, Discussed and Translated," *BJRL* 60 (1977-78) 376-403; idem, "Treatise of Shem," *OTP* 1.473-80. Note however the cogent critiques of S.P. Brock, [Review of *OTP* 1], *JJS* 35 (1984) 203-204; P.S. Alexander *apud* E. Schürer, *The History of the Jewish People in the Age of Jesus Christ* (3 vols. in 4; ed. G. Vermes, F. Millar, and M. Goodman; Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1973-87) 3/1.369-72.

[57]"And Noah wrote down everything in a book, as we instructed him about every kind of remedy: thus were the evil spirits kept from doing harm to Noah's sons. And he gave everything he had written to Shem, his eldest son; for he loved him most of all his sons." Translation is that of Charles and Rabin, "Jubilees," *AOT* (Sparks) 42.

[58]Note that the narrative setting roughly coincides with that of *Jubilees* 10. According to *Jub.* 7:1, Mount Lubar was the landing place of the ark. See *BHM* 3.155 lines 1-3; S. Müntner, *Mavo' le-sefer Asaf ha-Rofe'* (Jerusalem: Geniza, 1957) 147 lines 1-2. Regarding *Sefer Asaph*, see now M. Himmelfarb, "Some Echoes of *Jubilees* in Medieval Hebrew Literature," *Tracing the Threads: Studies in the Vitality of Jewish Pseudepigrapha* (SBLEJL 6; ed. J.C. Reeves; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1994) 127-36, as well as the further discussion in Chapter Six below.

[59]*BHM* 2.xxx; *Sefer ha-Razim* (ed. Margalioth) xiii, 37.

[60]al-Ṭabarî, *Ta'rîkh ar-rasul wa-l-mulūk* (cf. *Annales quos scripsit Abu Djafar Mohammed ibn Djarir at-Tabari* [15 vols.; ed. M.J. De Goeje; reprinted, Leiden: Brill, 1964-65] 1.173 line 3, 174 lines 6, 8-9).

[61]*2 Enoch* 10:2, 5-7 (short version): "And the Lord said to Vreveil, Take the books from their storeplace, and give Enoch a pen and dictate the books to him ... And all that it was proper that I should learn Vreveil explained to me in thirty days and thirty nights: his lips were never silent, as he went on speaking; and I, for my part, had no rest for thirty days and thirty nights, as I made my notes. And when I had finished, Vreveil said to me, Sit down: write out everything I have explained to you. And I sat down a second time for thirty days and thirty nights; and I wrote out everything exactly. And I wrote three hundred and sixty books." Translation cited from that of Pennington, *AOT* (Sparks) 338; compare F.I. Andersen, "2 (Slavonic Book of) Enoch," *OTP* 1.141.

[62]Critical editions of the Ethiopic text of *1 Enoch* are A. Dillmann, *Liber Henoch, Aethiopice ad quinque codicum fidem editus* (Leipzig: F.C.G. Vogel, 1851); J. Flemming,

Das Buch Henoch: Äthiopischer Texte (TU 7.1; Leipzig: J.C. Hinrichs, 1902); R.H. Charles, *The Ethiopic Version of the Book of Enoch* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1906); and M.A. Knibb, *The Ethiopic Book of Enoch* (2 vols.; Oxford: Clarendon, 1978), which also includes a translation and commentary. In addition to Knibb's study, the most useful translations and commentaries are A. Dillmann, *Das Buch Henoch* (Leipzig: F.C.W. Vogel, 1853); R.H. Charles, *The Book of Enoch* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1893; 2d ed., Oxford: Clarendon, 1912); idem, *APOT* 2.163-281; and M. Black, *The Book of Enoch or I Enoch* (SVTP 7; Leiden: Brill, 1985). Knibb's translation is reproduced in *AOT* (Sparks) 169-319.

[63]Aside from Jude 14-15 and patristic quotations, there are at present four surviving sources that attest the Greek rendition(s) of *1 Enoch*: 1) the Gizeh or Akhmim text (Codex Panopolitanus), containing 1:1-32:6 and a duplicate version of 19:3-21:9; 2) the Chester Beatty text, containing 97:6-104:13, 106:1-107:3; 3) the citations found in the Byzantine chronicle compiled by George Syncellus, featuring 6:1-10:14, 15:8-16:1, but which vary considerably from the Gizeh text; and 4) Codex Vaticanus Gr. 1809, containing 89:42-49. For a convenient edition of this material, see *Apocalypsis Henochi Graece* (PVTG 3; ed. M. Black; Leiden: Brill, 1970), and for discussion see especially Denis, *Introduction* 15-28; Knibb, *Book of Enoch* 2.15-21. Further fragments of yet another Greek witness have been tentatively proposed by J.T. Milik ("Fragments grecs du livre d'Hénoch (P. Oxy. xvii 2069)," *Chronique d'Égypte* 46 [1971] 321-43), but their poor condition precludes a firm identification.

[64]*1 Enoch* 6:1-7. See S.P. Brock, "A Fragment of Enoch in Syriac," *JTS* n.s. 19 (1968) 626-31.

[65]*1 Enoch* 93:3-8. See S. Donadoni, "Un frammento della versione copta del 'Libro di Enoch'," *AcOr* 25 (1960) 197-202.

[66]Aside from patristic citations, only an abridged version of *1 Enoch* 106:1-18. See James, *Apocrypha Anecdota* 146-50; Charles, *Ethiopic Version* 219-22.

[67]"Fragments of no fewer than eleven manuscripts of Enoch were found at Qumrân; of these, seven contain material corresponding to parts of the first (cc.1-36), the fourth (cc.83-90), and the fifth (cc.91-107) sections of the Ethiopic text ... while four contain material corresponding to parts of the third section (cc.72-82) ..." (Knibb, *Book of Enoch* 2.8). The *editio princeps* is J.T. Milik, *The Books of Enoch: Aramaic Fragments of Qumrân Cave 4* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1976); see also K. Beyer, *Die aramäischen Texte vom Toten Meer* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1984) 225-58.

[68]Given the recent discovery that the Aramaic fragments of *1 Enoch* already attest the union of chapters 1-5 and the Book of the Watchers (6-36), there is a present tendency to argue for a thematic relationship between these two originally discrete Enochic works. See for example G.W.E. Nickelsburg, *Jewish Literature Between the Bible and the Mishnah: A Historical and Literary Introduction* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1981) 48-49, or L. Hartman, *Asking for a Meaning: A Study of 1 Enoch 1-5* (ConBNT 12; Lund: CWK Gleerup, 1979).

[69]Charles, *Book of Enoch* xlvi-xlvii. He postulated that "fragments" of a "Book of Noah" were embedded throughout the present text of Enoch, identifying as such *1 Enoch* 6-11; 54:7-55:2; 60; 65-69:25; 106-107. See now also 1Q*19* "Livre de Noé" (DJD I 84-86, 152).

[70]The standard editions and translations are W.R. Morfill and R.H. Charles, *The Book of the Secrets of Enoch* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1896); N. Forbes and R.H. Charles, "2 Enoch or the Book of the Secrets of Enoch," *APOT* 2.425-69; G.N. Bonwetsch, *Die Bücher der Geheimnisse Henochs: das sogenannte slavische Henochbuch* (TU 44; Leipzig: J.C. Hinrichs, 1922); A. Vaillant, *Le livre des secrets d'Hénoch: texte slave et traduction française* (Paris: Institut d'études slaves, 1952); Andersen, *OTP* 1.91-221; Pennington, *AOT* (Sparks) 321-62.

[71]Andersen, *OTP* 1.93-94. See also S. Pines, "Eschatology and the Concept of Time in the Slavonic Book of Enoch," *Types of Redemption: Contributions to the Theme of the Study Conference Held at Jerusalem 14th to 19th July 1968* (Leiden: Brill, 1970) 72 n.1; idem, "Enoch, Slavonic Book of," *EncJud* 6.797: "Nonetheless the long recension seems to contain some material belonging to the original text omitted from the short recension."

[72]See the extensive list of parallels adduced by Ginzberg, *Legends* 5.158-62 n.60. Note also J.C. Reeves, "Jewish Pseudepigrapha in Manichaean Literature: The Influence of the Enochic Library," *Tracing the Threads* (ed. Reeves) 184-91.

[73]The "long" version adds a third son, Gaidad (see Andersen, *OTP* 1.108). According to the medieval *Sefer ha-Yashar*, Enoch had three sons (Methusaleh, Elishua, Elimelek) and two daughters (Milkah, Naamah); see *BHM* 4.130. But compare *2 Enoch* 57:2 (Andersen, *OTP* 1.182-83)!

[74]Pennington, *AOT* (Sparks) 338.

[75]So Ginzberg, *Legends* 5.159; more cautious is Andersen, *OTP* 1.140.

[76]*2 Enoch* 11:36-37. Translation taken from that of Pennington, *AOT* (Sparks) 342.

[77]It in fact requires a separate monograph for the collection and analysis of these testimonies. I am presently engaged in the preparation of such a source.

[78]*Tg. Ps.-J.* Gen 5:24: ופלח חנוך בקושטא קדם יי והא ליתוהי עם דיירי ארעא ארום אתנגיד וסליק לרקיעא במימר קדם יי וקרא שמיה מיטטרון ספרא רבא ; regarding the meaning of אתנגיד in this context, see especially the remarks of S. Lieberman, *Hellenism in Jewish Palestine* (2d ed.; New York: Jewish Theological Seminary of America, 1962) 13-15. Note also *3 Enoch* (Schäfer §5): ... אמר ר' ישמעאל אמרתי לו למטטרון מפני מה אתה נקרא בשם קונך בשבעים שמו' ומפני מה קורין אותך בשמי מרומים נער השיב ואמר לי מפני שאני הוא חנוך בן ירד שכשחטאו בני דור המבול ... ונטלני ה'ב'ה מביניהם להיות עד עליהם ... וסרחו במעשיהם . Text cited from Ms. Vat. 228, as reproduced in *Synopse zur Hekhalot-Literatur* (ed. P. Schäfer; Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr, 1981). For further remarks, consult Ginzberg, *Legends* 5.162-64.

[79]Most scholars explain this curious circumstance to the explosive growth in prominence of the figure of Seth, who has assumed in many gnostic texts most of the qualities traditionally associated with Enoch.

[80]*Pistis Sophia* 3.134 (Schmidt-MacDermot 349-50); see also 2.99 (ibid. 246-47). Codex Brucianus contains two tractates which have been published under the designation "the Two Books of Jeu," but aside from their obvious affinities with passages cited in *Pistis Sophia*, there appear to be few (if any) links with known Enochic lore. The standard editions are *Pistis Sophia* (NHS 9; ed. C. Schmidt and V. MacDermot; Leiden: Brill, 1978); *The Books of Jeu and the Untitled Text in the Bruce Codex* (NHS 13; ed. C. Schmidt and V. MacDermot; Leiden: Brill, 1978). See also the remarks of Stroumsa, *Another Seed* 108-110.

[81]Pseudo-Eupolemus *apud* Eusebius, *Praeparatio Evangelica* 9.17.9: Ἕλληνας δὲ λέγειν τὸν Ἄτλαντα εὑρηκέναι ἀστρολογίαν, εἶναι δὲ τὸν Ἄτλαντα τὸν αὐτὸν καὶ Ἑνώχ "the Greeks say that Atlas discovered astrology, but Atlas is the same (person) as Enoch." Text cited from Eusebius, *Die Praeparatio Evangelica* (GCS 43; 2 vols.; ed. K. Mras; Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1954-56) 1.504 lines 7-8. For the association of Atlas with astrology, see especially Diodorus Siculus 3.60.2, 4.27.4-5, and

the references provided by B.Z. Wacholder, "Pseudo-Eupolemus' Two Greek Fragments on the Life of Abraham," *HUCA* 34 (1963) 96 n.83. Theodore bar Konai is also cognizant of this association; see below.

[82]Theodore bar Konai, *Liber scholiorum* (CSCO scrip. syri, ser. II, t. 66; ed. A. Scher; Paris: Carolus Poussielgue, 1912) 286.5-11: ܗܘ ܕܩܕܡ ܠܫܪܒܐ ܕܫܡܗ ܐܬܪܝ ܗܘ ܕܐܒܗ ܕܒܪܕܝܣܢ ܐܡܪ

Klöster in Ägypten," *Das römisch-byzantinische Ägypten: Akten des internationalen Symposions 26.-30. September 1978 in Trier* (Mainz am Rhein: Von Zabern, 1983) 102-108. Note also J.C. Reeves, "The 'Elchasaite' Sanhedrin of the *Cologne Mani Codex* in Light of Second Temple Jewish Sectarian Sources," *JJS* 42 (1991) 68-91.

[97]Pliny, *Naturalis Historia* 5.15.73. A convenient edition of this text appears in A. Adam and C. Burchard, *Antike Berichte über die Essener* (2d ed.; Berlin: W. de Gruyter, 1972) 38.

[98]Given impetus by such influential treatments as J.T. Milik, *Ten Years of Discovery in the Wilderness of Judaea* (SBT 26; Naperville, IL: Alec R. Allenson Inc., 1959) 44-128; A. Dupont-Sommer, *The Essene Writings from Qumran* (reprinted, Gloucester, MA: Peter Smith, 1973) 39-67; F.M. Cross, *The Ancient Library of Qumran & Modern Biblical Studies* (rev. ed.; reprinted, Grand Rapids, MI: Baker, 1980) 49-106; G. Vermes, *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Qumran in Perspective* (rev. ed.; Philadelphia: Fortress, 1981) 116-36. For the latest expression of this consensus, see J.C. VanderKam, *The Dead Sea Scrolls Today* (Grand Rapids, MI: William B. Eerdmans, 1994) 71-119.

[99]The two most important critiques have been offered by L.H. Schiffman, *Reclaiming the Dead Sea Scrolls* (Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society, 1994), and N. Golb, *Who Wrote the Dead Sea Scrolls? The Search for the Secret of Qumran* (New York: Scribner, 1995).

[100]This is one of the many important points scored in the recent stimulating monograph by Golb.

[101]For descriptions of this recovery, along with assessments of its significance, see "Genizah, Cairo," *EncJud* 16.1333-42; S. Schechter, "A Hoard of Hebrew Manuscripts," *Studies in Judaism: Second Series* (Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society, 1908) 1-30; S.D. Goitein, *A Mediterranean Society: The Jewish Communities of the Arab World as Portrayed in the Documents of the Cairo Geniza* (6 vols.; Berkeley: University of California Press, 1967-93) 1.1-28. Note also P. Kahle, *The Cairo Genizah* (2d ed.; Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1959). An important bibliographical survey is included in R.S. Humphreys, *Islamic History: A Framework for Inquiry* (rev. ed.; Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1991) 261-73.

[102]See the references adduced in Schürer, *History* (ed. Vermes, et al.) 3/1.203-204; also A.A. Di Lella, "Qumrân and the Geniza Fragments of Sirach," *CBQ* 24 (1962) 245-67; P.W. Skehan and A.A. Di Lella, *The Wisdom of Ben Sira: A New Translation with Notes* (AB 39; New York: Doubleday, 1987) 51-54, 57-61.

[103]H.L. Pass and J. Arendzen, "Fragment of an Aramaic Text of the Testament of Levi," *JQR* o.s. 12 (1899-1900) 651-61; R.H. Charles and A. Cowley, "An Early Source of the Testaments of the Patriarchs," *JQR* o.s. 19 (1906-07) 566-83; R.H. Charles, *The Greek Versions of the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1908) 245-56. Regarding the Genizah fragments, see especially J.C. Greenfield and M.E. Stone, "Remarks on the Aramaic Testament of Levi from the Geniza," *RB* 86 (1979) 214-30.

[104]S. Schechter, *Documents of Jewish Sectaries, Volume 1: Fragments of a Zadokite Work* (Cambridge, 1910; reprinted, New York: Ktav, 1970).

[105]Milik, *Ten Years of Discovery* 38, 151-52; DJD III 128-31, 181; Wacholder-Abegg, *Preliminary Edition* 1.1-59.

[106]Ben Sira: DJD III 75-77; DJD IV 79-85 (11QPs^{a} cols. 21-22); note also the larger fragments recovered from Masada. Aramaic Levi: DJD I 87-91; J.T. Milik, "Le Testament de Lévi en araméen: Fragments de la grotte 4 de Qumrân," *RB* 62 (1955) 398-406; idem, *Books of Enoch* 23; E. Puech, "Fragments d'un apocryphe de Lévi et le personnage eschatologique: 4QTestLévi^{c-d}(?) et 4QAJa," *The Madrid Qumran Congress: Proceedings of the International Congress on the Dead Sea Scrolls, Madrid 18-21 March, 1991* (2 vols.; ed. J. Trebolle Barrera and L. Vegas Montaner; Leiden: Brill, 1992) 2.449-501; M.E. Stone and J.C. Greenfield, "The Prayer of Levi," *JBL* 112 (1993) 247-66.

[107]N. Wieder, *The Judean Scrolls and Karaism* (London: East and West Library, 1962) 254-57; B.Z. Wacholder, *The Dawn of Qumran: The Sectarian Torah and the Teacher of Righteousness* (Cincinnati: Hebrew Union College Press, 1983) 141-69. This view is actually an updated version of A. Geiger's classic theory regarding the origins of the Karaite movement. Geiger argued that Karaism was directly indebted to the clandestine survival of Second Temple Sadducean halakhah; see his "Sadducäer und Pharisäer," *Jüdische Zeitschrift für Wissenschaft und Leben* 2 (1863) 33-34; idem, *Judaism and its History* (2d ed.; New York: Bloch, 1911) 260-69. Geiger's position was ably summarized by S. Poznanski, "Anan et ses écrits," *REJ* 44 (1902) 168-74; also B. Revel, "Inquiry into the Sources of Karaite Halakah," *JQR* n.s. 2 (1912) 517-44; 3 (1913) 337-96.

[108]For example, Abraham ibn Ezra, *Ha-qedmah perush ha-Torah*: וזאת דרך הצדוקים כענן ובנימין ... "this is the method of the 'Sadducees,' like 'Anan [ben David] and Benjamin [al-Nahawandi] ...," and the passage goes on to name other Karaite luminaries. Text cited from Abraham ibn Ezra, *Perushey ha-Torah* (3 vols.; ed. A. Weiser; Jerusalem: Mossad Harav Kook, 1977) 1.2. Note also Abraham ibn Daud, *Sefer ha-Qabbalah*: כי אחר חרבן הבית נדלדלו הצדוקים עד שעמד ענן וחזקם "after the (Roman) destruction of the Temple, the Sadducees languished until the advent of 'Anan, who reinvigorated them." Text cited from A. Neubauer, *Mediaeval Jewish Chronicles and Chronological Notes* (2 vols.; reprinted, Amsterdam: Philo Press, 1970) 1.64. See also Poznanski, *REJ* 44 (1902) 169-71; Wacholder, *Dawn of Qumran* 156.

[109]Azariah di Rossi, *Me'or 'Enayim* (3 vols.; Vilna, 1866; reprinted, Jerusalem: Maqor, 1970) 1.90-97. See also Y.M. Grintz, "The Yahad Sectarians, Essenes, Beth(e)sin," *Sinai* 32 (1954) 11-43 (Hebrew); Y. Sussmann, "The History of Halakha and the Dead Sea Scrolls: Preliminary Observations on *Miqṣat Ma'ase Ha-Torah* (4QMMT)," *Tarbiz* 59 (1990) 11-76 (Hebrew).

[110]See *t. Roš Haš.* 1.15 (cf. *b. Roš Haš.* 22b and Rashi *ad loc.*); *m. Ḥag.* 2:4 (cf. Bertinoro *ad loc.*); *m. Menaḥ.* 10:3 (cf. *b. Menaḥ.* 65a-b); *b. Šabb.* 108a (cf. *Sop.* 1:2); *t. Yoma* 1.8 (cf. *m. Yoma* 5:1); *m. Para* 3:7.

[111]So Wacholder, *Dawn of Qumran* 162-69.

[112]Eusebius, *Historia ecclesiastica* 6.16.3.

[113]O. Braun, "Ein Brief des Katholikos Timotheos I über biblische Studien des 9. Jahrhunderts," *OrChr* 1 (1901) 138-52, 299-313; O. Eissfeldt, "Der gegenwärtige Stand der Erforschung der in Palästina neu gefundenen hebräischen Handschriften," *TLZ* 74 (1949) 597-600; R. de Vaux, "A propos des manuscrits de la mer Morte," *RB* 57 (1950) 417-29; A. Paul, *Écrits de Qumran et sectes juives aux premiers siècles de l'Islam* (Paris: Letouzey et Ané, 1969) 94-96.

[114]Ya'qūb al-Qirqisānī, *Kitāb al-anwār wa-l-marāqib* (5 vols.; ed. L. Nemoy; New York: Alexander Kohut Memorial Foundation, 1939-43) 1.11-12; al-Bīrūnī, *al-Āṯhar al-bāqiya 'an-il-qurūn al-khāliya* (*Chronologie orientalischer Völker von Albêrûnî* [ed. C.E. Sachau; reprinted, Leipzig: Otto Harrassowitz, 1923]) 284.6-11; al-Shahrastānī, *Kitāb milal wa-l-niḥal* (2 vols.; ed. M.S. Kilani; Beirut: Dar el-Marefah, n.d.) 1.216-18, where

testimony about the "cave sect" is combined with information about the Yūdghānites, an eighth-century Jewish messianic movement; Judah b. Elijah Hadassi, *Sefer Eshkol ha-kopher* (Eupatoria, 1836; reprinted, Westmead: Gregg International Publishers, 1971) 41b, §98. Qirqisānī apparently relies upon the authority of Dā'ūd b. Marwān al-Muqammiṣ, a ninth-century exegete who flirted with Christianity before returning to the Jewish fold, for his information about this sect, whereas al-Bīrūnī cites the famous *zindiq* Abū 'Isa al-Warrāq as his source. The dependencies of al-Shahrastānī and Judah Hadassi are less clear, but probably go back ultimately to the former source. See A. Harkavy, "Abū Yūsuf Ya'qūb al-Qirqisānī on the Jewish Sects," *Ya'qūb al-Qirqisānī on Jewish Sects and Christianity: A Translation of "Kitāb al-anwār" Book I, with Two Introductory Essays* (ed. B. Chiesa and W. Lockwood; Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang, 1984) 58-59.

[115] واتما أسميوا بهذا لأن كتبهم أصيبت فى مغار (ed. Nemoy 1.12 line 1). A recent comprehensive discussion analyzing the significance of this sect is J. Fossum, "The Magharians: A Pre-Christian Jewish Sect and its Significance for the Study of Gnosticism and Christianity," *Henoch* 9 (1987) 303-44; see also the earlier studies of E. Bammel, "Höhlenmenschen," *ZNW* 49 (1958) 77-88; N. Golb, "Who Were the Magārīya?" *JAOS* 80 (1960) 347-59. S.M. Wasserstrom has prepared an important and revolutionary analysis of al-Shahrastānī's report on the *Maghārīyya* in light of certain traditions contained in *Sefer ha-Bahir*; see his *Judaism, Islam and Gnosis: Studies in Esotericism* (Albany: SUNY Press, forthcoming).

[116] Paramount in significance here are the intriguing reports referring to the survival of a "book" (or "books") authored by Zadok, founder of a Second Temple sect who engaged in polemics with the Rabbanites. Note Qirqisānī, *Kitāb al-anwār* (ed. Nemoy) 1.11 lines 12-16: وظهر بعد ظهور الربانيّين الصدوقيّة وصاحباهم צדוק وبيثوس وكانا فيما أخبر الربانيّون تلميذين ل אנטיגנוס الذى كان بعقب שמעון הצדיק وعن שמעון أخذا وצדוק هو أوّل من كاشف الربانيّين وأظهر الخلاف عليهم وأطلع شيءا من الحقّ ودوّن كتابا أكثر فيه من ثلب الربانيّين والطعن عليهم "After the Rabbanites appeared the Sadducees; their leaders were Zadok and Boethus. They were, according to the Rabbanites, pupils of Antigonus who succeeded Simeon the Righteous and received instruction from him. Zadok was the first who exposed the Rabbanites and disagreed with them; he discovered part of the truth and wrote books in which he strongly rebuked and attacked them." Translation cited from L. Nemoy, "Al-Qirqisānī's Account of the Jewish Sects and Christianity," *HUCA* 7 (1930) 326. Note also the curious information relayed in a tenth-century Judaeo-Arabic manuscript commentary to Exodus cited by Harkavy, "Qirqisānī" 83 n.29, and Poznanski, *REJ* 44 (1902) 176-77: "... well known among the people are books of the Zadokites (!), but they contain nothing which this man (Saadia Gaon) mentions. In the books of Zadok (are) things he censured the Rabbanites for during the Second Temple (period), such as sacrifices and the like."

[117] Hava Lazarus-Yafeh (*Intertwined Worlds: Medieval Islam and Bible Criticism* [Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1992] 132 n.5) has called attention to an interesting narrative found in al-Ma'sūdī regarding the ninth-century Egyptian governor Aḥmad b. Tūlūn's patronage of learned conferences featuring dialogues among Jews, Christians, "philosophers, dualists, Bardaiṣanists, Sabaeans, Zoroastrians, and Muslim *mutakallim*" (*Murūj al-dhahab* 2.391). Translation ibid., or *Les prairies d'or* (5 vols.; ed. C. Pellat; Paris: Société asiatique, 1962-) 2.304. As an indication of the subjects discussed in such conferences, note the immediately preceding narrative wherein a Coptic Christian levels criticism against the alleged Jewish practice of

worshiping "the little lord called Metatron" (ميططرون) on Yom Kippur, one of the *many* places where the entity "Metatron" appears outside of Jewish literature (*contra* C.R.A. Morray-Jones, "Transformational Mysticism in the Apocalyptic-Merkabah Tradition," *JJS* 43 [1992] 9, whose pronouncement is apparently based upon a misunderstanding of P.S. Alexander, "The Historical Setting of the Hebrew Book of Enoch," *JJS* 28 [1977] 180). For copious documentation of Metatron in non-Jewish sources, see especially Wasserstrom, "Magical Texts" 163-66. An informative exposition of the inter-religious intellectual cross-fertilization taking place within early 'Abbāsid Islam is provided by Wasserstrom, "Sefer Yeṣira and Early Islam: A Reappraisal," *Journal of Jewish Thought and Philosophy* 3 (1993) 1-30; and see now the same author's magisterial *Between Muslim and Jew: The Problem of Symbiosis under Early Islam* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1995).

[118] Jude 14-15; *Barn.* 4:3, 16:5, 16:6.

[119] Irenaeus, *Adversus haereses* 1.20.1.

[120] Of fundamental importance for this issue is R.A. Kraft, "The Pseudepigrapha in Christianity," *Tracing the Threads* (ed. Reeves) 55-86. I rely on his insights for much of what is stated in this paragraph.

[121] John of Damascus and especially Theodore bar Konai provide valuable reports about some of these later Syrian and Mesopotamian sects, occasionally providing quotations from their "sacred" texts. For a comprehensive discussion, see J.C. Reeves, "Theodore bar Konai and Syro-Mesopotamian Gnosis," *ANRW* (forthcoming).

[122] S. Gero, "With Walter Bauer on the Tigris: Encratite Orthodoxy and Libertine Heresy in Syro-Mesopotamian Christianity," *Nag Hammadi, Gnosticism, and Early Christianity* (ed. C.W. Hedrick and R. Hodgson, Jr.; Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1986) 287.

[123] E.S. Drower, *The Haran Gawaita and the Baptism of Hibil-Ziwa* (Rome: Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, 1953) 3.

[124] For a recent discussion, with copious bibliography, see Sinasi Gündüz, *The Knowledge of Life: The Origins and Early History of the Mandaeans* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1994).

[125] *Acta Archelai* 64.5: Tunc adsumit illos libellos et transfert eos, ita ut multa alia ex semet ipso insereret eis, quae anilibus fabulis similia sunt. Text cited from Hegemonius, *Acta Archelai* (GCS 16; ed. C.H. Beeson; Leipzig: J.C. Hinrichs, 1906) 93. The translation is that of S.D.F. Salmond, *ANF* 6.231.

[126] I. de Beausobre, *Histoire critique de Manichée et du manichéisme* (2 vols.; Amsterdam: J.F. Bernard, 1734-39). See Reeves, *Jewish Lore* 24.

[127] J.T. Milik, "Turfan et Qumran: Livre des Géants juif et manichéen," *Tradition und Glaube: Das frühe Christentum in seiner Umwelt* (ed. G. Jeremias, H.-W. Kuhn, and H. Stegemann; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1971) 117-27; idem, *The Books of Enoch* 298-339.

[128] συνήφθη δὲ τούτοις μετέπειτα ὁ καλούμενος Ἠλξαῖ ἐν χρόνοις βασιλέως Τραιανοῦ μετὰ τὴν τοῦ σωτῆρος παρουσίαν, ὃς ἐγένετο ψευδοπροφήτης (*Panarion* 19.1.4). Text cited from Adam-Burchard, *Essener*[2] 52.

[129] Ὀσσαῖοι δὲ μετέστησαν ἀπὸ Ἰουδαϊσμοῦ εἰς τὴν τῶν Σαμψαίων αἵρεσιν, οἵτινες οὐκέτι οὔτε Ἰουδαῖοι ὑπάρχουσιν οὔτε Χριστιανοί (*Panarion* 20.3.4). Text from Adam-Burchard, *Essener*[2] 53.

[130] Σαμψαίων ... τῶν δὴ καὶ Ἐλκεσαίων καλουμένων (*Panarion* 53.1.1). Text cited

from A.F.J. Klijn and G.J. Reinink, *Patristic Evidence for Jewish-Christian Sects* (NovTSup 36; Leiden: Brill, 1973) 194.

[131]When this happens is unclear. Elchasai himself was Jewish, if Epiphanius can be trusted (*Panarion* 19.1.5), and there is nothing in the preserved testimonies that connotes a Christian orientation for the sect's founder.

[132]References to the "commandments of the Savior" (τὰς ἐντολὰς τοῦ σωτῆρος) are surely to Jesus, as *CMC* 91.19-93.23 illustrates.

[133]See Reeves, *Jewish Lore*, passim.

[134]The apt application of the term "symbiosis" to the intermingled currents of late antique and medieval Near Eastern religiosities appears most prominently in the influential studies of S.D. Goitein and H.J.W. Drijvers. For the former, see especially the historical analysis provided by S.M. Wasserstrom, "Recent Works on the 'Creative Symbiosis' of Judaism and Islam," *RelSRev* 16.1 (1990) 43-47. Drijvers employs the term when describing the religious influences active in late antique Edessa; see his "Edessa und das jüdische Christentum," *VC* 24 (1970) 4-33, at p. 5 ("eine Symbiose"); idem, "Rechtgläubigkeit und Ketzerei im ältesten syrischen Christentum," *OCA* 197 (1972) 291-308, at p. 303 ("eine Art Symbiose").

[135]See Wasserstrom, *Judaism, Islam and Gnosis* (forthcoming); idem, *Between Muslim and Jew*, portions of which Professor Wasserstrom has been kind enough to share with me in manuscript form.

PART TWO

THE *CMC* APOCALYPSE FRAGMENTS AND JEWISH PSEUDEPIGRAPHA

CHAPTER THREE

THE APOCALYPSE OF ADAM

Text

[οὕτ]ω πρῶτο[ς ὁ] Ἀδὰμ [ὡς φανε]ρώτ[ατα] εἶπεν [ἐν τῇ ἀποκαλύψει] αὐτοῦ [ὅτι ἐθεώρησα ἄγ]γελον [..... ..... . ἀπ]καλυ[..... ....] ο [..... .... ἔμπροσθεν τοῦ λαμ] προῦ προσώπου σου ὃν ἐγὼ οὐ γινώσκω. τότε ἔφη αὐτῷ· ἐγώ εἰμι Βάλσαμος ὁ μέγιστος ἄγγελος τοῦ φωτός. ὅθεν δεξάμενος γράψον ταῦτα ἅπερ σοι ἀποκαλύπτω ἐν χάρτῃ καθαρωτάτῳ καὶ μὴ φθειρομένῳ καὶ σῆτα μὴ ἐπιδεχομένῳ. χωρὶς καὶ ἄλλων πλείστων ὧν αὐτῷ ἀπεκάλυψεν ἐν τῇ ὀπτασίαι. μεγίστη γὰρ ἦν ἡ περὶ αὐτὸν δόξα. ἐθεώρησεν δὲ κα[ὶ ...] ἀγγέλους κα[ὶ ἀρχιστρα]τήγου[ς καὶ δυνάμεις] μεγί[στας --- 5 lines lost ---] ον ὁ Ἀδὰμ καὶ γέγονεν ὑπέρτερος παρὰ πάσας τὰς δυνάμεις καὶ τοὺς ἀγγέλους τῆς κτίσεως. πολλὰ δὲ καὶ ἄλλα τούτοις παραπλήσια ὑπάρχει ἐν ταῖς γραφαῖς αὐτοῦ.[1]

Translation

[Thu]s has [the] first Adam [clearl]y said [in] his [apocalypse: 'I saw an a]ngel [...] [before] your ra[diant] face which I do not recognize.' Then he said to him: 'I am Balsamos, the greatest angel of Light. Therefore receive (and) write these things just as I reveal them to you on exceedingly clean papyrus which is unspoiled and which has not harbored worms.'

Moreover there were many other things which he revealed to him in the vision. Very great was the glory that surrounded him. He beheld [...] angels an[d high offic]ials [and] mig[hty powers] ... (5 lines lost) ... Adam and was made superior to all the powers and angels of creation. Many other similar things to these are in his writings.

Commentary

[οὕτ]ω πρῶτο[ς ὁ] Ἀδὰμ [ὡς φανε]ρώτ[ατα] εἶπεν [ἐν τῇ ἀποκαλύψει] αὐτοῦ "[Thu]s has [the] first Adam [clearl]y said [in] his [apocalypse]." The editors' restoration of the source cited here as an "apocalypse" of Adam has much to commend it. Symmetry is maintained with the remaining four quotations of works authored by the biblical forefathers, each of which is introduced as an "apocalypse." Moreover, the editorial frame-narrative explicitly appeals "to how each one of the primeval patriarchs communicated his own revelation (literally, 'apocalypse') to a select (group) whom he chose and gathered together from that generation during which he appeared."[2] As we have seen, several testimonies survive regarding the existence of one or more "apocalypses" of Adam among Christian and gnostic communities in late antiquity.

Of especial interest in this particular clause is the apparent designation of Adam as "first Adam"; i.e., "Adam the Protoplast," the Greek reflex of the common rabbinic titles אדם הראשון or אדם קדמאה. A similar title (*nwxwyr*) is employed by certain Manichaean Middle Iranian texts when speaking of the first materially created human being: "And when the male creature was born, they named him 'the first human being,' namely Gēhmurd."[3] This distinctive nomenclature is necessary within the Manichaean system due to the prior supernal "creation" of a heavenly prototype, Primal Man,[4] whose appealing form, according to at least one early testimony, stimulates the subsequent production of the human race by demonic archons.[5] We are thus presented with a dual heavenly/earthly anthropos motif in Manichaeism that is structurally parallel to the Adam Qadmon/Adam the Protoplast concept found in certain esoteric strands of late antique and medieval Judaism, a similarity that was presciently noted long before the publication of the relevant Manichaean evidence by Louis Ginzberg.[6] The point of origin for this concept in Judaism is the curious dual notice of the creation of Adam in the biblical cosmogony (Gen 1:26-27; 2:7), usually glossed by modern critics as representative strands of two originally separate sources employed by the author(s) of the biblical book of Genesis. The first report of Adam's creation comes to be viewed as the evocation of a "heavenly Adam" or "original Adam" (אדם קדמון) who serves as the model for the lineaments of the subsequent "earthly" or "material" Adam of Gen 2:7. While the earliest expression of this quasi-Platonic exegesis is found in Philo,[7] it is clear from rabbinic sources that Philo is not totally indebted to Greek philosophical speculation for his articulation of this interpretation. Traces of a similar type of speculative exegesis manifest themselves within the aggadic literature, sometimes there explicitly associated with heretical or heterodox circles (*minim*).[8] Patristic writers also vouch for the popularity of the cosmic anthropos scheme among a variety of late antique gnostic sects.[9] Given Mani's sectarian patrimony, which wove together a tapestry of threads

emanating from Judaism, Christianity, and gnostic currents, it is not surprising to find him conversant with this concept.

[ὅτι ἐθεώρησα ἄγ]γελον [..... ..... . ἀπ]καλυ[..... ....] ο [..... .... ἔμπροσθεν τοῦ λαμ]προῦ προσώπου σου ὃν ἐγὼ οὐ γινώσκω "[I saw an a]ngel [...] [before] your ra[diant] face which I do not recognize." Greek ὅτι, assuming the editors' restoration is accurate at this point, would reflect the common usage of Syriac ܕ in its function of introducing a quotation, here the initial citation from the "apocalypse" of Adam. Due to this portion's fragmentary state, one might too hastily conclude that little of concrete import can be gleaned from it. Presumably it contained a notice of the setting and initial events associated with the angelophany experienced by Adam. Since Adam does not recognize his visitor, it is apparently the first time that he has encountered this particular entity.

A similar passage featuring the manifestation of unknown heavenly entities before Adam appears early in the Coptic *Apocalypse of Adam*: "And I (Adam) saw three men before me whose likeness I was unable to recognize, since they were not the powers of the god who had [created us]" (65.26-31).[10] Here Adam's initial puzzlement over the identity of his visitors is justified. They were not agents of the demiurgic god (Sakla) who created the material world, but rather emissaries of the "God of truth"[11] who dwells in heaven. They were dispatched in order to rouse Adam "from the sleep of death," and to teach him about "the aeon and the seed of that man to whom life has come," as well as revealing to him the course of future events (66.2-6; 67.14ff.). They are in other words "illuminators of knowledge" (76.9-10),[12] divine messengers who impart gnosis regarding the actual circumstances surrounding the fabrication of the material universe. This cluster of anthropogonic motifs, which is characteristic of gnostic cosmogonic traditions, suggests an interesting possibility for the provenance of the *Codex* fragment since there, too, Adam is confronted with an angelic visitor whose identity is unknown to the seer. Does a gnostic anthropogony lie behind the *Codex* account?

It might prove useful to recall that the Manichaean anthropogonic myth attributed the creation of Adam (and Eve) to the cohabitation of Ashaqlūn (i.e., Sakla), crown prince of the Realm of Darkness, and his consort Namrael:

> Ashaqlūn, son of the King of Darkness, said to the abortions: 'Give me your sons and daughters, and I will make for you a form like the one you saw.' They brought (them) and gave (them) to him. He ate the males, and the females he gave to Nebrūēl his wife. Nebrūēl and Ashaqlūn then united together, and she became pregnant from him and gave birth to a son, naming him Adam. She (again) became pregnant and bore a daughter, naming her Eve.[13]

Adam the protoplast however subsists in a prostrate state of "deep sleep"[14] until visited and aroused by Jesus the Splendor, who "showed him the Fathers on high," and "made him taste of the Tree of Life."[15] Jesus the Splendor thus functions in Theodore bar Konai's narrative as the Manichaean counterpart to the heavenly "illuminators" of the Coptic *Apocalypse of Adam*, an inversion of the role played by the serpent/Samael/Satan within

the temptation-story of Jewish and Christian *Adamschriften*.[16] These latter traditions however do reserve a locus for the intervention of divine emissaries, normally at the narrative point immediately after Adam's repentance for his disobedience. Impressed by Adam's sincere remorse, God dispatches one or more angels to impart to the protoplast useful information that mitigates the severity of the curses laid upon Adam, Eve, and the earth.[17] In some of these texts, Adam also becomes privy to knowledge about the future history of his descendants.

To which narrative tradition does our Adam fragment belong? Its poor state of preservation prevents us from making any definitive decision, but the motif of "non-recognition" hints at a gnostic, or at the very least gnostically influenced, setting. We will need therefore to pay careful attention when analyzing the remaining scraps of this citation to see whether the Adam fragment retains further clues regarding its possible conceptual affinities with a gnostic world-view.

τότε ἔφη αὐτῷ· ἐγώ εἰμι Βάλσαμος ὁ μέγιστος ἄγγελος τοῦ φωτός "Then he said to him: 'I am Balsamos, the greatest angel of Light.'" Of especial interest here is the disclosure of the identity of the revelatory angel, a motif that is duplicated only once more in the series of "Jewish apocalypse" citations contained in the *Codex*. There (in the "apocalypse of Enoch") the familiar name of Michael appears, whereas here the strange cognomen "Balsamos" is used. One should note also the distinctive epithet borne by Balsamos: he is "the greatest angel of Light."

The sudden manifestation of an "angel of Light" to the unsuspecting Adam is intriguingly reminiscent of a signal event in the life of the young Mani. According to Manichaean sources, Mani was first apprised of his apostolic status by a succession of angelophanies featuring the revelatory instruction and guidance of an entity termed the "Twin,"[18] Mani's heavenly "duplicate"[19] who is ultimately an emanation of the Light-*Nous*, "the Father of all the Apostles" (*Kephalaia* 35.22). A narrative description of the initial visit of the Twin with Mani is supplied by Ibn al-Nadīm in his valuable account of Manichaean teachings:

> ... and when he (Mani) was twelve years old, a revelation came to him. According to his account, (it was) from the King of the Paradise of Light, who is God Most High from what he says about him. The angel who brought the revelation was called *al-Tawm*, which is in Nabataean,[20] and its meaning is "companion."[21]

Note that the language used to describe the source of Mani's revelation faintly echoes that used within the Adamic fragment: the term "Light" serves as a circumlocution for the celestial realm in both accounts, even though it is slightly expanded in the Arabic testimony (... *Paradise of* Light),[22] and both angelic entities are dispatched from this realm to communicate (explicitly in Mani's case, presumably in that of Adam, save that the information has largely perished) valuable heavenly mysteries. The similarity of structure and characterization suggests a possible redactional adjustment (or perhaps even independent creation?) of Jewish pseudepigraphic fragments or works, such

as this Adam fragment, to fit their new utilitarian employment within Manichaeism, a practice that is clearly visible in the surviving Middle Iranian versions of the Jewish Second Temple era *Book of Giants*.[23] We must therefore proceed with some caution in our examination, and allow the cumulative weight of the background of the visible narrative traditions to determine whether we are dealing with an authentic survival of Jewish aggadic lore, a textual nugget that has been "lightly" manipulated, or an overt Manichaean forgery.

Manichaean angel-lists recovered from Central Asia sometimes include a figure designated "Bar-Simus" (*br symws*),[24] a name whose form echoes that of Balsamos, but it is unclear whether there is any connection between them. A heavenly entity of similar name figures once in the collection of Greek magical papyri published by Karl Preisendanz. Therein we read: ἐγω εἰμι ὁ πεφυκὼς ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ, ὄνομά μοι Βαλσάμης "I am the one who is from heaven; my name is Balsamēs."[25] The feminine form of the name occurs within a sales contract preserved among the Oxyrhynchus papyri hoard, where it is borne by a servant from Osroene, the province of Edessa.[26] That circumstance suggests that the name may be of Syrian or north Mesopotamian provenance. Probably the most widely accepted interpretation of the name "Balsamos" views it as a Graecized form of the designation בעל שמין "Baal Shamayin," or "Lord of Heaven," the ancient Syro-Phoenician high god demoted (in this case) to archangelic rank.[27] However, there are no other discernible instances of analogous borrowings from the realm of Syro-Phoenician paganism within nascent or, for that matter, mature Manichaeism; rather, the Semitic roots of Manichaean ideology are demonstrably Jewish or Jewish-Christian. Nevertheless, the name "Balsamos" does look like a Semitic form with an appended Greek nominative masculine singular inflection.

There is now a more plausible interpretation of the name "Balsamos" that thoughtfully takes into account the actual religio-historical background from which Manichaeism emerged. Burt Visotzky has offered the intriguing suggestion that "Balsamos" may render the Hebrew expression בעל שם, literally "possessor of the (divine) Name,"[28] thus making Balsamos equivalent to the anonymous angel of Exod 23:20-23 (... כי שמי בקרבו ...) who is identified in some strands of later tradition as Metatron,[29] Yahoel,[30] or Michael.[31] His self-declared status as "the greatest" (ὁ μέγιστος) angel of the heavenly realm strengthens this possible identity.[32] Michael is frequently invoked within the aforementioned Manichaean angel-lists, and is explicitly identified as a revelatory agent in the angelophany experienced by Enoch that is quoted later in the *Codex* (see Chapter Seven below). Moreover, there exists some tantalizing evidence that Manichaeism was familiar with the angel designated "Yahoel" as well. According to the fifth-century report of the Byzantine heresiologist Theodoret, Manichaeans sometimes referred to the "Maiden of Light," an important heavenly entity within the Realm of Light, as "Ioel" (Ἰωήλ).[33] This statement inspired Scholem to cite the Manichaean equation as a suggestive prefiguration of the later kabbalistic identification of Metatron and the Shekinah.[34] Also of relevance is a valuable list of Manichaean

mythological figures supplied by Priscillian, fourth-century bishop of Avila, wherein we find both the names "Ioel" and "Balsamus" mentioned.[35] This evidence suggests that two separate entities are signaled by these designations, a situation that is remarkably similar to the distinction drawn between the angels Michael and Yoel in the Slavonic *Vita Adae et Evae*. On the other hand, it is fairly certain that Michael and Yahoel (= Yoel) were originally variant names for a single supernal entity. Perhaps then we should view the name "Balsamos" as a type of esoteric designation for the chief archangel, and understand his "true" identity to be an early refraction of that complex pattern of assimilations and combinations attested within late antique and medieval Judaism for the Michael/Yahoel/Metatron entity.[36]

Another factor that augments the connection of Balsamos in the Adam fragment with Michael or Yahoel is the demonstrable frequency with which these latter names appear in some of the extant Jewish and Christian *Adamschriften*. In the Latin *Vita Adae et Evae*,[37] which is viewed by some as an early representative example of what was once (and to a certain extent still is) a massive corpus of extrabiblical Adam traditions, Michael displays a narrative prominence that underscores his exalted position among the heavenly hierarchy, one that may even approach the status of "the greatest angel of Light." When God first created Adam, Michael compels his fellow angels to offer homage to the freshly fabricated "image of God the Lord," meeting resistance only from Satan and his associates (13:2-16:4). Eve gives birth to Cain with Michael's assistance (21:1-3), he instructs Adam in agricultural science (22:2), and escorts a repentant Adam to the "Paradise of righteousness" into the very throne-room of God, where he learned that his descendants would retain the privilege of serving Him (25:2-29:1). Michael denies Eve and Seth access to oil from the Tree of Life, a remedy which they hoped would alleviate Adam's bodily sufferings, and forecasts the protoplast's death six days hence (41:1-43:2). When Adam dies, Michael (assisted by Uriel) oversees the funeral arrangements, and the two archangels bury both Adam and the long-deceased Abel (46:2-48:7). Prior to Eve's demise, she informs her children of a prophecy imparted long ago by Michael predicting two universal cataclysms, first by water and then by fire (49:2-3). After Eve's burial, Michael appears again in order to reveal to Seth proper mourning procedure (51:1-2).

The Greek *Apocalypse of Moses* and the Slavonic *Vita Adae et Evae* parallel the Latin *Vita* in its emphasis upon Michael as a major angelic character in the narrative movement of their respective plots. These two Adam-books moreover include notice at certain points of another interlocutor who converses with Adam, but who is distinguished from Michael, named "Yoel" (Ἰωήλ, *Yoel*), a name that is surely a by-form of the Hebrew Yahoel familiar from late antique magical and pseudepigraphical literature.[38] While in the *Apocalypse of Moses* the name "Yael" is used to address God himself (29:4; 33:5; compare *Apoc. Abr.* 17:11), the Slavonic *Vita* understands the term as a designation for a separate angelic being: "Then we heard Michael the archangel and Joel praying for us, and Joel the archangel

was commanded by the Lord, and he took a seventh part of paradise and gave it to us" (31:2; see also 32:2-3).[39]

Given the attested prominence of angelic actors like Michael and Yahoel in extant Adam-books, some of whose traditions may go back to the first century CE, and given further the inner connections and identifications within Jewish esoteric lore among entities like Michael, Yahoel, and the later Metatron, it seems possible to interpret the designation "Balsamos" as an alternate cognomen for one of those archangels. If Visotzky is correct in his reconstruction of its Hebrew origin, "Balsamos" would then most likely be the angel Yahoel, since that name explicitly incorporates the divine consonants. This is the most satisfactory explanation for the identity of the mysterious Balsamos who reveals himself to Adam in our fragment.

Connections with Second Temple Jewish angelology are also visible in the pregnant designation "greatest angel of Light." The Greek phrase "angel of light" is used once in the New Testament by Paul when he is describing how Satan possesses the ability "to transform himself into an angel of light" (2 Cor 11:14).[40] At Qumran, where with regard to heavenly entities the terms "angel" (מלאך) and "prince" (שר) are functional synonyms,[41] a so-called "prince of light" has been appointed by God to exercise authority over the righteous, whereas Belial, "the angel of enmity" (מלאך משטמה) , plots to corrupt and lead astray all those who strive to adhere to God's law.[42]

Extremely interesting, however, for our investigation of the language of this Adam fragment is an Aramaic pseudepigraphon recovered from Qumran known as 4Q'Amram (4Q*543-548*).[43] This curious work recounts a dream experienced by 'Amram, the father of Moses (Exod 6:20), wherein he beholds two angelic beings engaged in fierce combat for exclusive control of his destiny. The frightened 'Amram questions the combatants concerning their identities and responsibilities, and learns that they exercise sovereignty over "all the descendants of Adam." His interlocutor informs him that while "Melchireša'" rules "Darkness," "I [rule the whole of light ...] from the heights to the depths, I rule all of Light ...."[44] When 'Amram asks for the name of this "ruler of Light," he indicates that he bears "three designations," none of which unfortunately are preserved in the manuscript. However, using information gathered from other Qumran documents, Milik has plausibly suggested restoring one of the missing names as "Melchizedek," an appellation that appropriately mirrors that of his wicked opponent "Melchireša'." Support for his reconstruction is readily available from another Qumran text (11QMelch)[45] wherein Melchizedek, the mysterious royal priestly figure of Gen 14:18-20 and Ps 110:4, appears as an angelic entity with eschatological significance.[46] Milik goes on to propose possible restorations for the missing names of the "ruler of Light" and the "ruler of Darkness" (assuming from the principle of divine symmetry that the latter bore three names as well)[47]—"Michael" and "Prince of Light" for the "ruler of Light"; "Belial" and "Angel of Darkness" for the "ruler of Darkness."[48]

Of especial relevance here is the angelic "ruler of Light," however cleverly his cognomens might be restored. It is readily apparent that such an important heavenly entity could fittingly be termed "the greatest angel of

Light" (ὁ μέγιστος ἄγγελος τοῦ φωτός), and that we are essentially dealing with the same being in these two separate narrative contexts: Balsamos; i.e., Yahoel or Michael in the Adamic fragment, and the "ruler of Light"; i.e., Michael/Melchizedek or the "prince of Light" in 4Q'Amram. It should also be remarked that the stringent dualistic imagery employed throughout 4Q'Amram eerily presages the ideology of gnosis,[49] rendering such a text attractive to those individuals or groups operating within this worldview. Unfortunately, aside from a possible reference to the contents of 4Q'Amram by Origen,[50] there is no evidence that this text ever circulated outside of Qumran circles.

ὅθεν δεξάμενος γράψον ταῦτα ἅπερ σοι ἀποκαλύπτω ἐν χάρτῃ καθαρωτάτῳ καὶ μὴ φθειρομένῳ καὶ σῆτα μὴ ἐπιδεχομένῳ. "'Therefore receive (and) write these things just as I reveal them to you on exceedingly clean papyrus which is unspoiled and which has not harbored worms.'" As the editors of the *editio princeps* rightly emphasize, the purpose of this injunction is to insure the preservation of Adam's testimony for future generations;[51] a similar command occurs later in the "apocalypse of Enosh," wherein Enosh is bidden to inscribe his experience upon bronze tablets (*CMC* 54.11-17). They furthermore direct attention to a number of analogous prescriptions for the recording of divinely revealed information within roughly contemporaneous Jewish pseudepigraphic texts, although none of them specifically enjoin the scribal technique recommended here.[52] The use of "clean papyrus," i.e., blank or previously unused, as a writing surface is however well attested within the Greek magical papyri collection published by Preisendanz.[53]

A major criticism levelled against the so-called "ancestral religions" by Manichaean sources is their unreliability with regard to the faithful preservation and transmission of the teachings of their founders. Figures such as Jesus or the Buddha bequeathed no written testimonies for the edification of later generations; the preservation of their words lay completely in the hands of disciples, who could and did alter their formulation to achieve less than honorable ends.[54] In deliberate contrast to these predecessors, Mani painstakingly supplied his followers with a scriptural canon that bore the *imprimatur* of its founder. He composed the entire collection himself, a group of works that came to be termed the "living scriptures."[55] As a result of this emphasis upon authoritative *written* sources, and what is more, written by the author from whom they purportedly stem, great esteem came to be attached to the written word within Manichaeism, and the preparation and dissemination of Manichaean scriptures became an important part of their missionary enterprise. Manichaean scribes eventually achieve renown in Islamicate civilization for their skills in the art of book production.[56]

Thus the notice in this fragment about the importance of the careful preservation of Adam's testimony in written form takes on added import in the light of Manichaean attitudes about scriptural production and transmission. Adam—like Mani—is bidden to insure the faithful preservation and promulgation of his message by the preparation of an authoritative "book."

χωρὶς καὶ ἄλλων πλείστων ὧν αὐτῷ ἀπεκάλυψεν ἐν τῇ ὀπτασίαι. μεγίστη γὰρ ἦν ἡ περὶ αὐτὸν δόξα. ἐθεώρησεν δὲ καὶ ...] ἀγγέλους καὶ ἀρχιστρα]τήγου[ς καὶ δυνάμεις] μεγί[στας ... 5 lines lost ...] ον ὁ Ἀδὰμ καὶ γέγονεν ὑπέρτερος παρὰ πάσας τὰς δυνάμεις καὶ τοὺς ἀγγέλους τῆς κτίσεως "Moreover there were many other things which he revealed to him in the vision. Very great was the glory that surrounded him. He beheld [...] angels an[d high offic]ials [and] mig[hty powers] ... (5 lines lost) ... Adam and was made superior to all the powers and angels of creation." It is unfortunate that the citation becomes exceedingly fragmentary when we reach the point where a detailed description of the sights witnessed by Adam must have occurred. An ascent-experience, presumably facilitated by Balsamos,[57] may be presupposed in these lines: there is reference to an encompassing "glory" (δόξα) of the type characteristically encountered in the celestial realm,[58] along with vistas featuring angels, archangels (?), and sundry heavenly entities. Moreover, a transformation of Adam's human status is reported wherein he "was made superior to all the powers and angels."[59] This latter claim suggests a divine restoration to Adam of the position he enjoyed among the heavenly entities prior to his disobedience in the Garden, a lofty rank well exemplified by a popular aggadic legend recounting the circumstances surrounding the expulsion of Satan from heaven:

> It is for thy sake that I have been hurled from that place. When thou wast formed, I was hurled out of the presence of God and banished from the company of the angels. When God blew into thee the breath of life and thy face and likeness was made in the image of God, Michael also brought thee and made (us) worship thee in the sight of God; and God the Lord spake: 'Here is Adam. I have made thee in our image and likeness.' And Michael went out and called all the angels saying: 'Worship the image of God as the Lord God hath commanded.' And Michael himself worshipped first; then he called me and said: 'Worship the image of God the Lord.' And I answered, 'I have no (need) to worship Adam.' And since Michael kept urging me to worship, I said to him, 'Why dost thou urge me? I will not worship an inferior and younger being (than I). I am his senior in the Creation, before he was made was I already made. It is his duty to worship me.' .... And God the Lord was wrath with me and banished me and my angels from our glory; and on thy account were we expelled from our abodes into this world and hurled on the earth.[60]

Further interesting motifs are uncovered when one compares this relatively terse narrative with the version of this tale that is preserved within the Syriac *Cave of Treasures*, a text whose essential core (the so-called *Urschatzhöhle*) may date as early as the fourth century CE:[61]

> And God formed Adam with his (own) holy hands, in his (own) image and in his (own) likeness. And when the angels beheld the image and glorious appearance of Adam, they trembled before the splendor of his form, for they noticed that the form of his face when lit with the splendor of glory resembled (that of) the solar disk, and that the light of his eyes (was as bright) as the rays of the sun, and that the form of his body shone like gleaming crystal. When he stretched himself out and stood up at the center of the earth, he positioned his feet at the very spot where the Cross of our Savior will be erected. There he donned royal

garments, and had placed on his head a crown of glory, and was appointed king, priest, and prophet. There also God set him upon the throne of kingship. All the wild animals and winged creatures and cattle were gathered together (in order to) pass before Adam, and Adam designated their names, and they bowed their heads (before him) and worshiped him.

The angels and powers[62] of heaven heard the voice of God when he spoke to him: 'Adam, I have appointed you (to be) king, priest, prophet, lord, chief, and governor over all (those things) that have been made and created. To you alone I have given them, and to you I grant authority over everything that I have created.'[63] When the angels, archangels, thrones, dominions, cherubim, seraphim, and all the powers of heaven heard [this declaration, all of the celestial ranks praised and worshiped him (i.e., Adam)].

However, when the leader of the lowest celestial rank saw that awesome power had been given to Adam, he became jealous of him and refused to worship him alongside the angels. He said to his powers: 'Do not worship him, and do not praise (him) in company with the (other) angels! Rather, it is more fitting that he should worship me, since I (was created from) fire and spirit; I shall not worship dirt (or) that which was formed from dust!' While he thought these things, he became rebellious and disobedient, and thus of his own free will voluntarily separated himself from God, (and) was cast down and fell (from heaven), he and the whole of his company. On the sixth day; i.e., Friday, at the second hour, they were stripped of their glory. Hence his name (their leader) is called 'Satan' because he 'turned away' (from God), 'Demon' ( ) because he 'was cast down,' and 'Devil' ( ) because he 'lost' his garment of glory.[64] And from that time forth they (the satanic rank) became naked and of hideous appearance.

After Satan was expelled from heaven, Adam was elevated to ascend to Paradise in a chariot of fire while the angels sang praises before him and the seraphim chanted the *Qedushah* and the cherubim praised him, and with trumpet-blasts and hymns Adam entered Paradise.[65]

Both versions of this story emphasize that the newly created Adam possesses a godlike status (by virtue of his endowment with the divine image and likeness) that commands adoration and worshipful homage even from the ministering angels themselves.[66] However, the *Cave of Treasures* version foreshadows the consequences that follow the willful disobedience of divine directives: the rebellious angels forfeit their lofty position near the pinnacle of creation and are moreover stripped of their "glorious garments,"[67] luminous coverings that emulated (to some extent) the iridescence of heaven itself that is illuminated by the divine "Glory." Similarly Adam (and Eve) shall subsequently share an identical fate after their transgression in Paradise: a forcible expulsion (both physical and political) from their original abode and status, coupled with the removal of the "garments of light" that signaled their celestial status.[68] They too shall henceforth sojourn upon earth "naked and bare" of celestial accoutrement.[69]

Hence the "apocalypse" fragment under consideration suggests a reversal of Adam's "earthly" (or even "earthy") condition. The question is at what point in the broad narrative context of the formulated Adam traditions does the projected transformation occur? If the Adam fragment belongs among those traditions transmitted within eastern Christian *Adamschriften*, it should presuppose the same setting envisioned in works like the *Apocalypse of Moses* and *Vita Adae et Evae*: Adam no longer dwells in the Garden as before, he must now labor strenuously to procure sustenance for himself and his family (although neither Eve nor their progeny are featured in this fragment), and if the narrative tone of the aforementioned writings was maintained here, he feels intense remorse for his disobedience of God's command. For this reason the *Adamschriften* characteristically portray Adam as engaged in intensive ascetic exercises of penance. Their rigor seems designed to awaken the sympathy of God for the sufferer, which in turn may lead to a restoration of good relations with God. The usual result of these entreaties is an angelophany which produces some mitigation of what seem to be hopelessly harsh conditions.

The appearance of Balsamos to Adam in our fragment may have been prompted by a similar set of circumstances, especially if Balsamos is in fact an esoteric designation for an entity like Michael or Yahoel. Yet there remains a nagging problem with this line of interpretation, one that is signaled by the final clause of this particular excerpt: "and (he) was made superior to all the powers and angels *of creation*" (καὶ γέγονεν ὑπέρτερος παρὰ πάσας τὰς δυνάμεις καὶ τοὺς ἀγγέλους *τῆς κτίσεως*). Clearly the entities whom Adam surpassed in honor and prestige were demiurgic beings, as in *Apoc. Adam* 64.16-19: "for we were higher than the god *who had created us* and the powers with him."[70] The Adam fragment echoes, it would appear, those gnostic currents that held that Adam (at least his material body) was created by one or more "lower" angelic entities.

When read from that interpretive stance (i.e., as a "gnostic" anthropogony), the Adam fragment begins to resemble the Manichaean anthropogonic myth briefly outlined above. Prior to the visit of the emissary from the Realm of Light, Adam has knowledge only of that environment in which "the powers and angels of creation" have placed him. The arrival of Balsamos (who would thus correspond to Jesus the Splendor) awakens Adam to his true status within the created order: he reveals to Adam the Realm of Light and its inhabitants (the of Theodore bar Konai's testimony), and elevates him to a position of superiority *vis-à-vis* the archons of Darkness (perhaps implied in Theodore bar Konai's account by the consumption of fruit from the Tree of Life).[71] Indeed, reference to this experience may have once been present in the Adam fragment, inasmuch as five complete lines of text have been lost at precisely this point in the narrative.

Given the recurrent appearance of identifiably gnostic, even Manichaean, motifs in the surviving lines of our Adam fragment, it seems logical to conclude that this textual citation stems (at least in its present form) from a gnostic milieu, perhaps drawn from that collection of "books which they (the so-called Gnostics) call revelations of Adam" (Epiphanius, *Panarion* 26.8.1), or perhaps adapted from the vast storehouse of traditional Jewish and/or Christian Adamic lore. While, as we have seen, there are some verbal and conceptual affinities between our fragment and portions of the Coptic *Apocalypse of Adam*, they are by no means variant recensions of a common *Grundschrift*. Further, the intriguing hints at mature Manichaean themes and

mythologoumena that I have repeatedly identified above suggest a redactional process, one that has consciously accomodated what may have been originally a classical Gnostic or even "non-gnostic" Adam fragment to its "new" ideological environment. This means then that the *CMC* Adam fragment cannot be accepted as an authentic specimen of Jewish pseudepigraphic discourse. While it may have originated in such a setting, perhaps as early as the Second Temple period, its present formulation even in this fragmentary state betrays its gnostic genealogy.

πολλὰ δὲ καὶ ἄλλα τούτοις παραπλήσια ὑπάρχει ἐν ταῖς γραφαῖς αὐτοῦ "Many other similar things to these are in his writings." Presumably the "things" referenced here are items like angelophanies, revelatory discourses, descriptions of visionary experiences and/or ascents to heaven, and written records of the wisdom mediated through such encounters. Extant *Adamschriften* are replete with material of this sort.

APPENDIX: A TREASURY OF MANICHAEAN ADAM TRADITIONS

1. Theodore bar Konai, *Liber Scholiorum* (ed. Scher) 317-18:
Then the abortions took counsel together and recalled the form(s) of the Messenger that they had seen and said, 'Where is the form(s) that we saw?' And Ashaqlūn,[72] son of the King of Darkness, said to the abortions: 'Give me your sons and daughters, and I will make for you a form like the one you saw.' They brought (them) and gave (them) to him. He ate the males, and the females he gave to Nebrūēl[73] his wife. Nebrūēl and Ashaqlūn then united together, and she became pregnant from him and gave birth to a son, naming him Adam. She (again) became pregnant and bore a daughter, naming her Eve.[74]

He (then) says that Jesus the Splendor approached the unsuspecting Adam and roused him from the sleep of death,[75] that he might be delivered from the great spirit.[76] As (when) one who is righteous discovers a man possessed by a strong demon and calms him by his skill, so likewise it was with Adam when the Beloved One[77] found him prostrate in deep sleep. He roused him and shook him and woke him, and chased away from him the deceptive demon, and bound apart from him the great (female) archon.[78] Then Adam examined himself and recognized who he was, and (Jesus) showed him the Fathers on high,[79] and (revealed to him) regarding his own self (i.e., Jesus's) all that into which he (i.e., Jesus) had been cast—into the teeth of leopard(s) and the teeth of elephant(s), swallowed by voracious ones and absorbed by gulping ones, consumed by dogs, mixed and imprisoned in all that exists, bound in the stench of Darkness.[80] He (Mani) says that he (Jesus) raised him (Adam) up and made him taste of the Tree of Life.[81] Then Adam cried out and wept, and raised his voice loudly like a lion that roars and tears (prey). He cast (himself down) and beat (his breast) and said, 'Woe, woe to the one who formed my body, and to the one who bound my soul, and to the rebels who have enslaved me.'[82]

2. Ibn al-Nadīm, *Fihrist* (*apud* Flügel, *Mani* 58-61):
(Heading:) The Beginning of Sexual Reproduction According to the Teaching of Mani.
He (Mani) said, 'Then one of those archons, the stars, urgent force, desire, lust, and sin had sexual intercourse, and the result of their intercourse was the first man, who was Adam. That which produced this (was the union of) two archons, male and female.[83] Then intercourse took place once more, and its result was the beautiful woman,[84] who was Eve.'

He (Mani) said, 'When the five angels[85] saw the divine Light and Goodness which Desire[86] had plundered and bound as captive within those two who had been born, they asked al-Bashīr (= the Messenger), the Mother of Life, Primal Man, and the Living Spirit to send to this first-born creature someone to release and deliver him, to teach him knowledge and piety, and to deliver him from the satans.'

He (Mani) said: 'They thus sent Jesus, along with (another) deity.[87] They approached the two archons, confined them, and rescued the two who had been born.'

He (Mani) said: 'Then Jesus came and spoke to the one who had been born, who was Adam, and explained to him (about) the gardens (of Paradise), the deities, Gehenna, the satans, earth, heaven, sun, and moon. He also made him fear Eve, showing him how to suppress (desire) for her, and he forbade him to approach her, and made him fear to be near her, so that he did (what Jesus commanded). Then that (male) archon came back to his daughter, who was Eve, and lustfully had intercourse with her.[88] He engendered with her a son,[89] deformed in shape and possessing a red complexion,[90] and his name was Cain, the Red Man. Then that son had intercourse with his mother,[91] and engendered with her a son of white complexion, whose name was Abel, the White Man. Then Cain again had intercourse with his mother, and engendered with her two girls, one of whom was named Ḥakimat al-Dahr[92] and the other Ibnat al-Ḥirṣ.[93] Then Cain took Ibnat al-Ḥirṣ as his wife and presented Ḥakimat al-Dahr to Abel, and he took her as his wife.'[94]

He (Mani) said: 'In Ḥakimat al-Dahr there was a residue of the Light of God and His Wisdom,[95] but there was none of this (present) in Ibnat al-Ḥirṣ. Then one of the angels[96] came to Ḥakimat al-Dahr and said to her, "Watch yourself, for you will give birth to two girls who will fulfill the pleasure of God." He had sexual intercourse with her and she gave birth because of him to two girls, and she named one of them (Rau)-Faryād and the other Bar-Faryād.[97] When Abel learned of this, rage filled (him) and grief overcame him.[98] He said to her, "From whom did you produce these two children? I think they are from Cain; it was he who consorted with you!"[99] Although she described to him the form of the angel,[100] he left her and came to his mother, Eve, and complained to her about what Cain had done.[101] He said to her, "Have you heard what he did to my sister and wife?" When Cain learned this, he went to Abel and struck him with a rock, killing him.[102] Then he took Ḥakimat al-Dahr for a wife.'

Mani said: 'Then those archons and this al-Ṣindīd[103] and Eve were distressed at (the behavior) they saw (exhibited) by Cain. Al-Ṣindīd then taught Eve magical syllables[104] in order that she might infatuate Adam.[105] She proceeded to act (by) presenting him with a garland from a flowering tree,[106] and when Adam saw her, he lustfully united with her,[107] and she became pregnant and gave birth to a handsome male child[108] of radiant appearance.[109] When al-Ṣindīd learned about this, he was distressed and fell ill, and said to Eve, "This infant is not one of us; he is a stranger."[110] Then she wished to kill him, but Adam seized him and said to Eve, "I will feed him cow's milk and the fruit of trees!"[111] Thus taking him he departed. But al-

Ṣindīd sent the archons to carry off the trees and cattle, moving them away from Adam. When Adam saw this, he took the infant and encircled him within three rings. He pronounced over the first (ring) the name of the King of the Gardens, over the second the name of Primal Man, and over the third the name of the Living Spirit. He spoke to and implored God, may His name be glorified, saying, "Even though I have sinned before you, what offense has this infant committed?" Then one of the three (invoked deities) hurried (to Adam bearing) a crown of radiance, extending it in his hand to Adam.[112] When al-Ṣindīd and the archons saw this, they departed (and went) away.'[113]

He (Mani) said, 'Then there appeared to Adam a tree called the lotus, and milk flowed from it, and he fed the boy with it. He named him (the boy) after its name, but sometime later he renamed him Shāthil (i.e., Seth).[114] Then that al-Ṣindīd declared enmity against Adam and those who were born,[115] and said to Eve, "Reveal (yourself) to Adam; perhaps you may restore him to us." Then she made haste and seduced Adam, who lustfully united with her. When Shāthil saw him, he admonished and rebuked him (Adam), and said to him, "Arise, let us go to the East, to the Light and Wisdom of God."[116] So he left with him and resided there until he died and came to the Gardens (of Paradise).[117] Then Shāthil with Rau-Faryād and Bar-Faryād and Ḥakimat al-Dahr, their mother, practiced *ṣiddīqūt*,[118] following one way and one path until the time of their deaths, but Eve, Cain, and Ibnat al-Ḥiriṣ went to Gehenna.'[119]

3. M 7984 I R ii 33-V ii + M 7982 R + V + M 7983 I R + V:[120]
[Title]: The discourse about Gēhmurd (i.e., Adam) and Murdiyānag (i.e., Eve).[121]
(§37)[122] Then that Āz,[123] the one who had been deceived, was filled with great anger. She began wishing (to take) step(s), and she thought, 'I shall form two creatures, male and female, corresponding to the two forms, female and male,[124] of the god Narisah[125] which I saw, so that they can (eventually) be my clothing and covering. I would control them ...,[126] and these [two creatures?][127] shall not be taken away from me, and I shall not let them experience deprivation and suffering.'[128]

(§38) Then that Āz was clothed with all those progeny of the demons that had fallen from heaven to earth; (actually) that male arch-fiend and female arch-fiend[129] [who] were lion-shaped,[130] (and who) were lustful, wrathful, wicked, and thievish. And she (temporarily) made them her own covering and clothing;[131] inside these she was lustful.

(§39) And even as formerly (when) Āz herself in that blackness of hell, her own lair, had taught lewd behavior and sexual copulation to the demons and demonesses, wrathful demons, monsters, and arch-fiends, both male and female,[132] so too Āz again began teaching lewd behavior and sexual copulation in the same way to those other monsters and arch-fiends, males and females, who had fallen from heaven to earth[133] so that they would become sexually aroused, copulate by joining together their bodies, and give birth to dragon[134]-children. Āz could (then) take away and consume that progeny, and form from them two creatures, a man and a woman.

(§40) Thus the monster and the arch-fiend, the male one and the female one, taught all (the others) lewd behavior and sexual copulations, and (those others) joined their bodies together. They gave birth[135] to children and nurtured them. They (then) gave their own children to those two leonine arch-fiends, the male one and the female one, who were (serving as) clothes for Āz, and (who were consequently) lustful. And Āz (in their guise) consumed their children, and those two monsters, the male one and the female one, became (even more) lustful and were impelled to copulate. They joined their bodies together, and (from) that mixture[136] which clothed them, (which) was from the children of the monsters and arch-fiends which she had eaten, she constructed and made in accordance with her own desire a body in male form, with bone(s), nerve(s),[137] flesh, blood vessel(s), and skin.

(§41) And a soul was bound in that body, (the former deriving) from that light and beauty of the gods[138] which had become mixed in the children of the monsters through the eating of fruit and bud(s).[139] And in it (the body) were arranged their (the monsters') desire and lust, lewd behavior and sexual drive, enmity and slander, envy and wickedness, anger and impurity,[140] ill-humor and stupor, spiritual corruption and skepticism, stealing and lying, robbery and the doing of evil deeds, obstinancy and falsehood (?),[141] (the urge for) vengeance and conceit (?), sorrow and grief, pain and ache, poverty and want, disease and decrepitude, stench and thievishness (?).[142]

(§42) And in correspondence with the (types of) speech and voice possessed by those monstrous abortions, from whom she had formed that body, she (Āz) gave to that creature (those languages), so that it could speak and comprehend every kind of speech.[143]

(§43) And (it was) in accordance with that male form of the gods (i.e., the male aspect of Narisah, or the Messenger) which she had seen in the vessel[144] that she shaped and formed it (the first man).[145] Moreover she (Āz) bound to him (the first man) connection(s) and link(s) from above, from the sky—from monsters, arch-fiends,[146] constellations, and planets[147]—so that wrath, lust, and wickedness would rain down on him (the first man) from the monsters and constellations, and permeate his mind so that he would become more thievish, more monstrous, more greedy, and more lustful.[148] And when the male creature was born, they named him 'the first human being,'[149] namely Gēhmurd.

(§44) Then the two leonine arch-fiends, the male one and the female one, again consumed some of the children of their colleagues, and they were filled (with the urges for) lewd behavior and sexual activity. And they joined their bodies together.

(§45) And that Āz, who had filled them with those children of the monsters, the ones whom they had eaten, then shaped and formed in the same way another body, which was female, with bone(s), nerve(s), flesh, blood vessels, and skin. And a soul was bound in that body, (the former deriving) from the light and beauty of the gods which had become mixed in the children of the monstrous abortions through (the eating of) fruit and bud(s). And in it (the body) were arranged their (the monsters') desire and lust, lewd behavior and sexual drive, enmity and slander, envy and wickedness, anger and impurity, ill-humor and stupor, spiritual corruption and skepticism, stealing and lying, robbery and the doing of evil deeds, obstinancy and falsehood (?), (the urge for) vengeance and conceit (?), sorrow and grief, pain and ache, poverty and want, disease and decrepitude, stench and thievishness (?), and it was totally filled (with) evil belief and wickedness of every kind, more so than Gēhmurd.

(§46) And in correspondence with the (types of) speech and voice possessed by all those monstrous abortions, from whom she had formed (that body), she (Āz) gave to that female (those languages), so that she could speak and comprehend every kind of speech.

(§47) And (it was) in accordance with that female form of the gods (i.e., the female aspect of Narisah, or the Maiden of Light) which she had seen in the vessel that she shaped and formed it (the first woman). Moreover she (Āz) bound to her connection(s) and link(s) from the sky—from the constellations and planets—so that wrath, lewdness, and wickedness would rain down on her (the first woman) from the monsters and constellations, and permeate her mind (so that) she would become more thievish and sinful, lewd and lustful, and (thus) she (the woman) could deceive the man by lust.[150] Then from these two creatures would be born (children) in the human world, and they too would be greedy and lustful, behave angrily, vengefully, and ruthlessly, and afflict water, fire, tree(s), and plants.[151] They would worship greed and lust, accomplish the desire(s) of the demons, and would (finally) go to Hell.

(§48) When that female creature was born, they named her 'the female one of the glories,' namely Murdiyānag.

(§49) And when those two creatures, male and female, were born in the world, and had been nurtured and grew up, then Āz and the demonic arch-fiends were extremely joyful.[152] The ruler of the arch-fiends[153] assembled the monsters and arch-fiends, and (then) said to those two people, 'For your sake I have created earth and sky, sun and moon, water and fire, tree(s) and plants, and animals, so that you will be made happy in the world and rejoice and be glad, and will (then) do what I desire.'[154]

(§50) And (the ruler) appointed a dragon,[155] monstrous and terrible, (as) guardian over those two children (the first human couple) in order 'to guard them and not permit anyone to lead (them) away from us, since these monsters and arch-fiends are afraid of the gods and fear that they (the gods) may come upon us and smite us or bind us, for these two children were formed and shaped after the form and shape of the gods.'

(§51) Then as that first man (Gēhmurd) and 'the female one of the glories' (Murdiyānag), the first male and female persons, began living on earth, Āz awoke in them. Rancor filled them, and they began to clog up springs, to injure tree(s) and plants, to be raging (?) on earth, and to be greedy. They were not afraid of the gods, and they had no knowledge (of) those Five Light-Elements[156] which are distributed throughout the world, and (so) they constantly tormented them.[157]

4. Sundermann fragments:[158]

a. M 4500
Recto column I
1. ....
2. ....
3. a lecherous word
4. he (Šaklōn) spoke to her (Murdiyānag)
5. and immediately[159] she was
6. burning with lust, and he
7. [ ] among all (?)[160]
8. ....
9. [ ] (Gē)hmu[rd]
10. ....
11. ....

Recto column II
1. ....
2. ....
3. [t]hus he said:[161]
4. '[ ] how to endure (?)
5. and [ ]
6. he has made us joyful,
7. and from us
8. he has (?) [ ]'
9. ....
10. ....
11. ....
12. ....

Verso column I
1. ....
2. portrayed (?) [ ]
3. the angels [ ]
4. ....
5. invoked a name (?) [ ]
6. these angels
7. [ ] and the other
8. [ ] of (?) Gēhmurd
9. ....
10. ....
11. ....
12. ....

Verso column II
1. ....
2. [ ] M[u]rdiy[ānag]

3. [ ] and naked
4. before Gēhmurd [ ]
5. she stood [ ]
6. and was ador[ned with?] magical charms[162]
7. and [ ]
8. when Gēhmur[d]
9. then he [ ]
10. ....
11. ....

M 5566 and M 4501
Recto column I
1. ....
2. [ ] in anger. And
3. they came after [him]. Then he
4. immediately (brought) that child
5. forward and placed (him) on the ground
6. and drew seven lines[163] around
7. the child.[164]
8. And he [invoked] over (him)
9. the name of the Living and
10. Holy One.[165] And he spoke thusly:
11. '[ ] and escaped (?)
12. [ ] were all
13. ....'[166]

Recto column II
1. ....
2. [ ] desirous. Then
3. [ ] they stood
4. and from afar (his) son
5. [ ], in order that when
6. Gēhmurd removed him from
7. those lines, then they
8. could kidnap[167]
9. him. [ ]
10. Gēhmurd turned [his] face [ ]
11. to the Realm of Light.[168]
12. And he spoke thusly:[169]
13. '... you (pl.) ... [ ]'

Verso column I
1. ....
2. ....
3. and str[ong]
4. ....
5. [ ] was made

6. [ ] also that curse and
7. oa[th] he annulled
8. [ ] that child milk
9. [gi]ven.[170] And
10. Gēhmurd [bent himself] down
11. and lifted that child
12. up from the ground
13. [and] said:[171]

Verso column II
1. ....
2. '[G]o, that [ ]
3. and the filth of death
4. throw into the springs
5. of water, so that if
6. that child should drink (lit. "taste") (from there)
7. he would immediately die.' And he
8. ordered the female demonesses
9. 'that no one
10. of you [ ]
11. ....
12. that child[172]
13. ....'

M 5567
Recto column I
1. And eighty years, as long as
2. Murdiyānag no longer was in contact
3. with him, he lived in righteousness.[173]
4. And (even) during those many
5. years when Murdiyānag
6. was near Gēhmurd,
7. she did not become
8. pregnant by him. And
9. all the powers [ ]
10. [ ] were suffering.
11. ....

Recto column II
1. ....
2. and plant(s) [ ]
3. type [ ]
4. ....
5. ....
6. became pregnant (?)[174]
7. ....
8. and [ ]

Verso column I
1. ....
2. ....
3. [e]nd
4. ....
5. ....
6. ....
7. ....
8. ....

Verso column II
1. and [ ] and
2. then Murdiyānag was
3. grieving (?).[175] And
4. before Šaklōn and
5. before all the powers
6. of Šaklōn she swore
7. a mighty oath and
8. said: 'You (pl.) [ ]
9. by this [ ]
10. thing [ ]
11. ....
12. ....'[176]

M 4502
Page 1
1. ....
2. ....
3. [ ] east[177]
4. ....
5. ....

Page 2 of M 4502 and the whole of M 4503 too fragmentary for analysis.

M 2309
Verso
1. [ ] when he arranged
2. the *qšwdg*-world,[178] the cornerstone of
3. earth and heaven, and he apportioned in it
4. four worlds, and in those four
5. [worlds (?)] and ten
6. [heavens (?)].

Recto
1. [ ] the twelfth: pain and [ ][179]

2. And when those first two
3. destructive creatures were born, Adam and [ ] Eve,
4. people [ ]
5. ....

M 8280
Recto column I
1. [ ] those two
2. ....
3. [ ] the sinful Eve
4. [ ] Adam from the religion[180]
5. [ ] the third time and
6. [ ] purity

Recto column II
1. humans, animals (?), [ ]
2. like the seed [ ]

M 1859
Too fragmentary for reconstruction, but the names Šaklōn and Sethel (*šytyl*) appear.

NOTES

[1]*CMC* 48.16-50.7. Text cited from L. Koenen and C. Römer, *Der Kölner Mani-Kodex ... Kritische Edition* (Opladen: Westdeutscher Verlag, 1988) 30-32.

[2]*CMC* 47.3-11: ὡς εἷς ἕκαστος τῶν προγενεστέρων πατέρων *τὴν ἰδίαν ἀποκάλυψιν ἔδειξεν* τῇ ἑαυτοῦ ἐκλογῇ, ἣν ἐξελέξατο καὶ συνήγαγεν κατ' ἐκείνην τὴν γενεὰν καθ' ἣν ἐφάνη.

[3]M 7982 V i lines 21-24: *'wd k' h'n nr d'm z'd 'ygyš nwxwyr n'm nyys'd 'y xwd gyhmwrd*. Text cited from the edition of M. Hutter, *Manis kosmogonische Šābuhragān-Texte: Edition, Kommentar und literaturgeschichtliche Einordung der manichäisch-mittelpersischen Handschriften M 98/99 I und M 7980-7984* (Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz, 1992) 89; also M. Boyce, *A Reader in Manichaean Middle Persian and Parthian* (Leiden: Brill, 1975) 73. See F.C. Andreas and W.B. Henning, "Mitteliranische Manichaica aus Chinesisch-Turkestan, I," *SPAW* (1932) 197 n.2; corrected by W. Sundermann, *Mitteliranische manichäische Texte kirchengeschichtlichen Inhalts* (Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1981) 97 n.1.

[4]The entity Primal Man was "evoked" (קרא) by the Mother of Life, who was in turn the first evocation of the Father of Greatness, the ruler of the Manichaean Realm of Light. Primal Man plays a very important role in the Manichaean cosmogonical drama, and so his name is attested in practically every linguistic tradition from which we possess Manichaean texts or testimonies. See J.C. Reeves, *Jewish Lore in Manichaean Cosmogony: Studies in the Book of Giants Traditions* (Cincinnati: Hebrew Union College Press, 1992) 201 n.22. The Middle Iranian texts encode him as "the lord Ohrmizd," or "the god Ohrmizd."

[5]*Acta Archelai* 8.3: τότε τοίνυν καὶ ἡ ὕλη ἀφ' ἑαυτῆς ἔκτισε τὰ φυτὰ, καὶ συλωμένων αὐτῶν ἀπὸ τινων ἀρχόντων, ἐκάλεσε πάντας τοὺς τῶν ἀρχόντων πρωτίστους καὶ ἔλαβεν ἀπ' αὐτῶν ἀνὰ μίαν δύναμιν *καὶ κατεσκεύασε τὸν ἄνθρωπον τὸν κατὰ τὴν ἰδέαν τοῦ πρώτου ἀνθρώπου ἐκείνου* καὶ ἔδησε τὴν ψυχὴν ἐν αὐτῷ. See also ibid. 12.1-2: περὶ δὲ τοῦ Ἀδὰμ πῶς ἐκτίσθη, λέγει οὕτως· ὅτι ὁ εἰπών, δεῦτε, καὶ ποιήσωμεν ἄνθρωπον κατ' εἰκόνα ἡμετέραν καὶ καθ' ὁμοίωσιν, ἣ καθ' ἣν εἴδομεν μορφήν, ἄρχων ἐστίν, ὁ εἰπὼν τοῖς ἑτέροις ἄρχουσιν ὅτι, δεῦτε, δότε μοι ἐκ τοῦ φωτὸς οὗ ἐλάβομεν, καὶ ποιήσωμεν ἄνθρωπον κατὰ τὴν ἡμῶν, τῶν ἀρχόντων, *μορφήν, καθ' ἣν εἴδομεν, ὅ ἐστι πρῶτος ἄνθρωπος*· καὶ οὕτως ἔκτισε τὸν ἄνθρωπον. Texts cited from Hegemonius, *Acta Archelai* (GCS 16; ed. C.H. Beeson; Leipzig: J.C. Hinrichs, 1906). Another early source, the polemical treatise of Alexander of Lycopolis, may also testify to the idea that Primal Man served as a model for the demonic creation of corporeal Adam. See his *Contra Manichaei opiniones disputatio* (ed. A. Brinkmann; Leipzig: Teubner, 1895) §§4 and 23, and the remarks of G. Flügel, *Mani: seine Lehre und seine Schriften* (Leipzig, 1862; reprinted, Osnabrück: Biblio Verlag, 1969) 342; C.H. Kraeling, *Anthropos and Son of Man* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1927) 23-24. By contrast, authentic Manichaean sources and the later

testimonia identify the androgynous Third Messenger and/or the Maiden of Light as the prototypical "form(s)" copied in human creation; see the discussion below. While almost all students of Manichaean lore accept the authenticity of this latter tradition, the antiquity of the former concept (the *Acta Archelai* are pre-350 CE; Alexander circa 300 CE!) dictates that it be accorded some respect.

[6]L. Ginzberg, "Adam Ḳadmon," *JE* 1.182. Some classical Gnostic texts feature among their rosters of heavenly aeons an entity designated "Geradamas" (*Ap. John* 8.24; *Steles Seth* 118.26; *Zost.* 6.23, 13.16, 51.7; *Melch.* 8.6), a name that G.G. Stroumsa has persuasively explained as rooted in the Greek rendering (ὁ γεραιὸς ἄδαμας) of אדם קדמון. See his *Another Seed: Studies in Gnostic Mythology* (NHS 24; Leiden: Brill, 1984) 51 n.63.

[7]E.g., *L.A.* 1.31-32, 53-55, 88-96, 2.4; *Op.* 69-71, 134-47; *Quaest. in Gen.* 1.4, 2.56.

[8]A. Altmann, "The Gnostic Background of the Rabbinic Adam Legends," *JQR* 35 (1944-45) 371-91, reprinted in idem, *Essays in Jewish Intellectual History* (Hanover, NH: University Press of New England, 1981) 1-16; K. Rudolph, "Ein Grundtyp gnostischer Urmensch-Adam-Spekulation," *ZRGG* 9 (1957) 1-20. See now the recent discussion of J.E. Fossum, *The Name of God and the Angel of the Lord* (WUNT 36; Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr, 1985) 266-91. Fossum, e.g., calls attention to *t. Sanh.* 8.7 (Zuck. 428): אדם נברא באחרונה ולמה נברא באחרונה שלא יהו המינים אומרין שותף היה עמו במעשהו "Adam was created last (in the Genesis 1 account of creation); why was Adam created last? So that the *minim* could not assert that he (Adam) shared with Him in his (creative) work." Note also A.F. Segal, *Two Powers in Heaven: Early Rabbinic Reports about Christianity and Gnosticism* (SJLA 25; Leiden: Brill, 1977) 111-15.

[9]See the references adduced by F.H. Borsch, *The Son of Man in Myth and History* (NTL; Philadelphia: Westminster, 1967) 55-59, as well as Kraeling, *Anthropos and Son of Man*, 38-54.

[10]Translation cited from *The Nag Hammadi Library in English* (3d ed.; ed. J.M. Robinson; San Francisco: Harper & Row, 1988) 279.

[11]*Apoc. Adam* 65.11. Compare the identical designation of this entity found in Mani's *Shābuhragān*, as quoted by al-Bīrūnī: "Thereupon this revelation has come down, this prophecy in this last age through me, Mani, the messenger of the *God of truth* (الله الحق) to Babylonia" (*Chronologie orientalischer Völker von Albêrûnî* [ed. C.E. Sachau; reprinted, Leipzig: Otto Harrassowitz, 1923] 207.12-13). Note also *Acta Archelai* 12.4-5: τὸν δὲ λαλήσαντα μετὰ Μωϋσέως καὶ τῶν Ἰουδαίων καὶ τῶν ἱερέων τὸν ἄρχοντα λέγει εἶναι τοῦ σκότους ... *οὐκ ὢν ἀληθείας θεός*. διὰ τοῦτο οὖν ὅσοι ἐπ' ἐκεῖνον ἐλπίζουσι τὸν θεὸν τὸν μετὰ Μωϋσέως λαλήσαντα καὶ τῶν προφητῶν, μετ' αὐτοῦ ἔχουσι δεθῆναι, ὅτι οὐκ ἤλπισαν ἐπὶ *τὸν θεὸν τῆς ἀληθείας*. This appellation for the Father of Greatness is moreover used frequently in Coptic Manichaean literature; for a sampling of representative citations see especially P. Van Lindt, *The Names of Manichaean Mythological Figures: A Comparative Study on Terminology in the Coptic Sources* (Wiesbaden: O. Harrassowitz, 1992) 10-12.

[12]These entities are perhaps to be numbered among the "angels of the great light" who shall dwell with the descendants of Seth in "a holy dwelling-place" after the Flood (72.1-15).

[13]Theodore bar Konai, *Liber Scholiorum* (CSCO scrip. syri, ser. II, t. 66; ed. A. Scher; Paris: Carolus Poussielgue, 1912) 317.9-15: ܟܬܒܘ ܗܠܝܢ ܕܐܡܪ ܠܗ ܐܠܗܐ ܠܡܫܝܚܐ ܕܢܫܕܪ ܠܗ ܫܠܝܚܐ ܘܢܦܪܩ ܠܗ ܐܢܫܐ ܕܐܬܝܠܕ ܐܝܟ ܐܢܫ

similar use of the "reflection" metaphor, and see the discussion of Henrichs-Koenen, *ZPE* 19 (1975) 79 n.41*.

[20]In this context, the term "Nabataean" signifies "Aramaic"; more specifically, the eastern Aramaic dialect(s) of Mesopotamia. See T. Nöldeke, "Die Namen der aramäischen Nation und Sprache," *ZDMG* 25 (1871) 122-28.

[21]Ibn al-Nadīm, *Fihrist* (*apud* Flügel, *Mani* 50.10-13): فلما تمّ له اثنتا عشرة سنة اتاه الوحى على قوله من ملك جنان النور وهو الله تعالى عما يقوله وكان الملك الذى جاءه بالوحى يسمّى التوم وهو بالنبطيّة ومعناه القرين .

[22]Compare the expression used of the same entity in Ibn al-Nadīm, *Fihrist* (*apud* Flügel, *Mani* 56.12): ملك عالم النور "King of *the World of* Light." Note too that the word for "king" (ملك) can also be read "angel."

[23]See W.B. Henning, "The Book of the Giants," *BSOAS* 11 (1943-46) 52-74; Reeves, *Jewish Lore*.

[24]M 20: *xwd'y br symws* "the lord Bar-Simus" (text *apud* Boyce, *Reader* 192); M 4b: *pywhyšn 'y br symws* "invocation of Bar-Simus" (Boyce, *Reader* 191); M 1202: *brsymws fryštg* "Bar-Simus the angel" (Boyce, *Reader* 189); M 196: *mrsws nrsws nstyqws y'qwb 'wd qptynws s'ryndws 'wd 'hryndws syt 'wd brsymws (šw)b'n'n nyw'n* "Marsus, Narsus, Nastiqus, Jacob and Qaftinus, Sārindus and Āhrindus, Seth (?) and Bar-Simus, good shepherds", cited by W.B. Henning, "Two Manichaean Magical Texts, with an Excursus on the Parthian Ending *-ēndēh*," *BSOAS* 12 (1947-48) 51. See also A. Christensen, *L'Iran sous les Sassanids* (Copenhagen: Levin & Munksgaard, 1936) 186, and especially the remarks of W. Fauth *apud* H.-J. Klimkeit, *Hymnen und Gebete der Religion des Lichts: Iranische und türkische liturgische Texte der Manichäer Zentralasiens* (Opladen: Westdeutscher Verlag, 1989) 208 n.4.

[25]*PGM* IV.1020; note also XII.495. Translation cited from *The Greek Magical Papyri in Translation* (ed. H.D. Betz; Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1986) 58.

[26]P. Oxy. 3053 (dated 252 CE) lines 14-16, wherein we learn of the purchase of ... δούλην ὀνόματι Βαλσαμέαν .... Text cited from F. Millar, *The Roman Near East, 31 BC - AD 337* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1993) 556.

[27]See B.A. Pearson, "The Problem of 'Jewish Gnostic' Literature," *Nag Hammadi, Gnosticism, and Early Christianity* (ed. C.W. Hedrick and R. Hodgson, Jr.; Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1986) 28 n.77; A.I. Baumgarten, *The Phoenician History of Philo of Byblos* (Leiden: Brill, 1981) 149-51, 185-86.

[28]B. Visotzky, "Rabbinic Randglossen to the Cologne Mani Codex," *ZPE* 52 (1983) 298.

[29]See, e.g., *b. Sanh.* 38b, cited by Rashi *ad* Exod 23:21: ורבותינו אמרו זה מטטרון ששמו כשם רבו מטטרון בגימטריא שדי . As Scholem has remarked, this explanation is "incomprehensible" unless it originally referred to the name Yahoel. See G. Scholem, *Jewish Gnosticism, Merkabah Mysticism, and Talmudic Tradition* (2d ed.; New York: The Jewish Theological Seminary of America, 1965) 41; idem, *Major Trends in Jewish Mysticism* (3d ed.; reprinted, New York: Schocken, 1978) 68.

[30]*Apoc. Abr.* 10:9. The revelatory connection between Yahoel (יהואל) and Abraham survives in a twelfth-century manuscript emanating from the *Ḥasidei Ashkenaz*; see Scholem, *Major Trends* 366 n.108, where the relevant passage is transcribed.

[31]Cf. Ibn Ezra *ad* Exod 23:20: ווהו המלאך הוא מיכאל . Note the occurrence of the curious name "Besam'el" (בסמאל) in a Jewish amulet of unknown provenance (Syria or Lebanon?) next to that of "Michael" in J. Naveh and S. Shaked, *Magic Spells and Formulae: Aramaic Incantations of Late Antiquity* (Jerusalem: Magnes Press, 1993) Amulet #18 line 5 (p. 58).

[32]Compare the exalted status of Metatron in *3 Enoch* (Schäfer §15): וקראני מי הקטן בפני כל פמיליאה שלו שבמרום שנאמר כי שמי בקרבו "and he (God) proclaimed me 'the lesser YHWH' in the presence of all his retinue in the heavenly heights, as it is said 'for My Name is in him' (Exod 23:21)."

[33]*Haereticarum fabularum compendium* 1.26 (*PG* 83, col. 380A): καὶ τὸν μὲν Ἀδὰμ θηριόμορφον κτισθῆναι, τὴν δὲ Εὔαν ἄψυχον καὶ ἀκίνητον τὴν δὲ ἀῤῥενικὴν παρθένον, ἣν τοῦ φωτὸς ὀνομάζουσι θυγατέρα, καὶ Ἰωὴλ προσαγορεύουσιν, μεταδοῦναί φασι τῇ Εὔᾳ, καὶ ζωῆς καὶ φωτός. See F.C. Baur, *Das manichäische Religionssystem nach den Quellen neu untersucht und entwikelt* (Tübingen: C.F. Osiander, 1831) 151; W. Bousset, *Hauptprobleme der Gnosis* (Göttingen, 1907; reprinted, Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1973) 76-77. Note that the androgynous "virgin" Barbelo sometimes bears the name "Ioel" or "Iouel" in Coptic gnostic texts: *Gos. Eg.* 44.27; 50.2; 53.25; 55.22; 56.[20]; 59.23; 62.6; 65.23; *Zost.* 52.14; 54.17; 57.15; 62.12; 63.11; 125.14; *Allogenes* 50.20; 52.14; 55.18, 34; 57.25; and note the remarks of M. Scopello, "Youel et Barbélo dans le traité de l'*Allogène*," *Colloque international sur les textes de Nag Hammadi (Québec, 22-25 août 1978)* (ed. B. Barc; Québec: Les Presses de l'Université Laval, 1981) 374-82. This is surely no coincidence, particularly when one considers that the Manichaean "Maiden of Light" is likewise endowed with male and female attributes in order to "seduce" the archons. The correspondence warrants further investigation.

[34]G. Scholem, *Origins of the Kabbalah* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1987) 187. Scholem considers the similarity "hardly more than a coincidence" (ibid.). Note also idem, "Shekhinah: The Feminine Element in Divinity," *On the Mystical Shape of the Godhead: Basic Concepts in the Kabbalah* (New York: Schocken, 1991) 140-96; Scopello, "Youel et Barbélo" 380-82.

[35]See H. Chadwick, *Priscillian of Avila: The Occult and the Charismatic in the Early Church* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1976) 94.

[36]See Scholem, *Major Trends* 68-69; idem, *Jewish Gnosticism* 41-51; and especially the remarks of P.S. Alexander, "The Historical Setting of the Hebrew Book of Enoch," *JJS* 28 (1977) 161-67. Yahoel seems to be a predecessor of Metatron, to whom he is eventually assimilated (*3 Enoch* 48D:1 [Schäfer §76]), while Metatron is originally identical with "the prince" Michael. The oldest (fourth century?) attestation of the latter identification appears in the *Visions of Ezekiel*, for which see I. Gruenwald, "Re'uyot Yeḥezq'el," *Temirin: Texts and Studies in Kabbala and Hasidism, Volume I* (ed. I. Weinstock; Jerusalem: Mossad Harav Kook, 1972) 101-39, at p. 130.

[37]I cite from the edition of L.S.A. Wells, "The Books of Adam and Eve," *APOT* 2.123-54.

[38]*Apoc. Abr.* 10:4, 9; 17:11 (here as in *Apoc. Mos.* a designation of God himself); *Bib. Ant.* 26:12; *Sefer ha-Razim: A Newly Recovered Book of Magic from the Talmudic Period* (ed. M. Margalioth; Jerusalem: American Academy for Jewish Research, 1966) 83 line 38; 89 line 140; *3 Enoch* 48D:1 (§76 Schäfer); J.A. Montgomery, *Aramaic Incantation Texts from Nippur* (Philadelphia: The University Museum, 1913) #25 line 4 (as read by J.C. Greenfield, "Notes on Some Aramaic and Mandaic Magic Bowls," *JANESCU* 5 [1973] 155-56); J. Naveh and S. Shaked, *Amulets and Magic Bowls: Aramaic Incantations of Late Antiquity* (Jerusalem: Magnes Press, 1985) Bowl #5 line 8 (p. 160).

[39]*APOT* 2.134.

[40]καὶ οὐ θαῦμα, αὐτὸς γὰρ ὁ Σατανᾶς μετασχηματίζεται εἰς ἄγγελον φωτός. Interestingly, this very verse is paraphrased in the Latin *Vita*: "then Satan was wroth and transformed himself into the brightness of angels" (9:1; translation from *APOT* 2.136).

[41]Probably due to the influence of the book of Daniel, where angels of the nations are designated "princes." See Dan 10:13, 20-21; 12:1.

[42]1QM 13:9-10: ובגורל אור הפלחנו לאמתכה ושר מאור מאו פקדתה לעוורנו ובח[רתה בבני צד]ק וכול ; 1QS 3:20: וביד שר אורים ממשלת כול בני צדק בדרכי אור יתהלכו ; CD 5:17-19: כי רוחי אמת בממשלתו מלפנים עמד משה ואהרן ביד שר האורים ויקם בליעל את יחנה ואת אחיהו במזמתו בהושע ישראל את הראשונה.

[43]J.T. Milik, "4Q Visions de 'Amram et une citation d'Origène," *RB* 79 (1972) 77-97; P.J. Kobelski, *Melchizedek and Melchireša'* (Washington, DC: Catholic Biblical Association of America, 1981) 24-36; K. Beyer, *Die aramäischen Texte vom Toten Meer* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1984) 210-14.

[44]והוא משלט על כול חשוכא ואנה [משלט על כול נהורא ... ...] מן עליא עד ארעיא אנה שליט על כול נהורא. Text and suggested restorations cited from edition of Beyer, *Texte* 212 lines 15-16. The designation "Melchireša'" (מלכי רשע) for the ruler of Darkness is preserved in line 13.

[45]For the latest transcription of this text, see E. Puech, "Notes sur le manuscrit de XIQ Melkisedeq," *RevQ* 12 (1987) 483-513.

[46]Milik, *RB* 79 (1972) 85-86; idem, "*Milkî-ṣedeq* et *Milkî-reša'* dans les anciens écrits juifs et chrétiens," *JJS* 23 (1972) 95-144. The apotheosis, so to speak, of Melchizedek can be traced from late antique Jewish pseudepigrapha (*2 Enoch*) and the New Testament Epistle to the Hebrews (7:1-10) through various gnostic formulations into the Muslim world. See Segal, *Two Powers* 193-95; B.A, Pearson, "The Figure of Melchizedek in Gnostic Literature," *Gnosticism, Judaism, and Egyptian Christianity* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1990) 108-23; S.M. Wasserstrom, "Jewish Pseudepigrapha in Muslim Literature: A Bibliographical and Methodological Sketch," *Tracing the Threads: Studies in the Vitality of Jewish Pseudepigrapha* (SBLEJL 6; ed. J.C. Reeves; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1994) 97; G. Vajda, "Melchisédec dans la mythologie ismaélienne," *JA* 234 (1943-45) 173-83. A prime candidate for the transmission of this motif is the sect dubbed "Melchizedekians" by Christian heresiographers; see Epiphanius, *Panarion* 55, and the discussion of Fossum, *Name of God* 183-88. There exist some intriguing hints within rabbinic tradition that Melchizedek shall serve as eschatological high priest; see *b. Sukk.* 52b; *'Abot R. Nat.* A 34 (ed. Schechter 50b); and in general, Kobelski, *Melchizedek* 68-70.

[47]An interesting parallel to this portion of 4Q'Amram is found in *Ap. John* 11.8-19, wherein the initial demiurgic activity of Yaldabaoth is described: "... but he did not send forth from the power of the light which he had taken from his mother (i.e., Sophia), for he is ignorant darkness. And when the light had mixed with the darkness, it caused the darkness to shine. And when the darkness had mixed with the light, it darkened the light and it became neither light nor dark, but it became dim. Now the archon who is weak has three names. The first name is Yaltabaoth, the second is Saklas, and the third is Samael." We behold here an arrestingly similar sequence of motifs to those of the Qumran document: a description of the relationship between light and darkness, followed by a three-fold identification of a supernal entity. Translation of the passage from the *Apocryphon of John* is cited from *Nag Hammadi Library*[3] (ed. Robinson) 111.

[48]Milik, *RB* 79 (1972) 86. The designations "Prince of Light" and "Angel of Darkness" are actually used in Qumran sectarian literature; see above. Belial is "le nom traditionnel du chef des mauvais esprits," and is also attested at Qumran, although a viable alternative might be Mastema, the name borne by the head of the evil spirits in *Jubilees*, and which also is found in Qumran literature. Michael is of course well attested as the principal archangel, and the possible invocation of his name here is further abetted by hints of an assimilation or identification of the figures of Michael and Melchizedek in sectarian literature. This fusion is made conceptually possible through the idea that Michael functions as heavenly high priest: see *b. Ḥag.* 12b; *b. Menaḥ.* 110a; *b. Zebaḥ.* 62a. For the possibility that this identification already appears at Qumran, see A.S. van der Woude, "Melchisedek als himmlische Erlösergestalt in den neugefundenen eschatologischen Midraschim aus Qumran Höhle XI," *OTS* 14 (1965) 354-73; C. Newsom, *Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice: A Critical Edition* (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1985) 37-38. P.S. Alexander (*JJS* 28 [1977] 162 n.12) quotes a late rabbinic text that explicitly states their identity.

[49]The following features are quite suggestive: Light and Darkness imagined as "realms" or "principalities," each with a "ruler"; the division of humanity between these two "realms"; those who belong to Darkness characterized as "foolish" or "wicked," while the "sons of Light" are "wise" or "righteous"; the latter are destined to receive further "illumination" through the impartation of "knowledge" (מנדע), while the "sons of Darkness" can anticipate the terrors of "Death" and "Abaddon"; the locus of the "realm of Light" is "to the north." This last motif corresponds with the sacral cosmology of both classical and Mesopotamian systems of gnosis; see Reeves, *Jewish Lore* 177-78 n.24 and the discussion in Chapter Five below.

[50]Milik, *RB* 79 (1972) 86-92. His suggestion, while ingenious, remains dubious.

[51]Henrichs-Koenen, *ZPE* 19 (1975) 49 n.89.

[52]*As. Mos.* 1:16-18; *Adam and Eve* 50:1-2; Josephus, *Ant.* 1.70-71 are probably the most relevant.

[53]Henrichs-Koenen (*ZPE* 19 [1975] 49 n.89) cite *PGM* III.18; IV.78; VII.193, 703; XXXVI.70-71, 102. Regarding the importance of "new" or "fresh" materials in magical praxis, see also Naveh-Shaked, *Amulets* 88-89.

[54]F.C. Andreas and W.B. Henning, "Mitteliranische Manichaica aus Chinesisch-Turkestan, II," *SPAW* (1932) 295 n.3.

[55]Middle Persian *n[by]g'[n] zyndg'n* (M 5794 I V lines 11-12). Text cited from *Mir. Man. II* 296; see also Boyce, *Reader* 30.

[56]See for example the remarks of al-Jāḥiẓ excerpted in K. Kessler, *Mani: Forschungen über die manichäische Religion* (Berlin: Georg Reimer, 1889) 366.

[57]Note the psychopompic roles of Michael in the Latin *Vita Adae et Evae* 25:2-3, and of Yaoel in *Apoc. Abr.* 15:3-5.

[58]See *2 Enoch* 13:27 (short); *Apoc. Abr.* 15:6: "And I (i.e., Abraham) saw in the air, on the height to which we went up, a great light, which is indescribable." Translation cited from that of A. Pennington, "The Apocalypse of Abraham," *AOT* (Sparks) 379.

[59]B.A. Pearson has noted the similarity of this transformation to *Apoc. Adam* 64.14-19: "and we (Adam and Eve) resembled the great eternal angels, for we were higher than the god who had created us and the powers with him." See his "Jewish Sources in Gnostic Literature," *Jewish Writings of the Second Temple Period* (CRINT II.2; ed. M.E. Stone; Philadelphia & Assen: Fortress & Van Gorcum, 1984) 451. By contrast, G.W.

MacRae has stated that the *CMC* Adam fragment has "nothing in common with the Nag Hammadi work" (*OTP* 1.710). This judgment is profoundly wrong.

[60]Latin *Vita Adae et Evae* 13:1-14:3, 16:1 (*APOT* 2.137). See also the *Questions of Bartholomew* 52-55 (*apud* E. Hennecke, *New Testament Apocrypha* [2 vols.; ed. W. Schneemelcher; Philadelphia: Westminster, 1963-65] 1.500), and Qur'ān 2:34; 7:11-13; 15:29-35; 17:61; 18:50; 20:116; 38:71-78. An exemplary discussion of this motif is that of H. Speyer, *Die biblischen Erzählungen im Qoran* (reprinted, Hildesheim: Georg Olms, 1988) 54-58; see also L. Ginzberg, *The Legends of the Jews* (7 vols.; Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society, 1909-38) 5.84-86 n.35. According to *Pirqe R. El.* 14, Samael and his host were cast out from heaven because he successfully deceived Adam, an expulsion which in terms of the narrative chronology established by Genesis 2-3 occurs later than the banishment envisioned by the aforementioned texts. Rev 12:7-9 foresees an eschatological recapitulation of Satan's rebellion where once again he and his angelic allies will be driven from the presence of God. *2 Enoch* 29:4-5, 31:3-6 (long version) are also cognizant of the tradition of the fall of Satan(ael), although here the expulsion occurs on the second day of the week of creation; i.e., prior to the fabrication of Adam.

[61]A. Götze, "Die Schatzhöhle: Überlieferung und Quellen," *Sitzungsberichte der Heidelberger Akademie der Wissenschaften, Phil.-hist. Kl.* 4 (1922) 1-92. For the most recent useful discussions, see Su-Min Ri, "La Caverne des Trésors: problèmes d'analyse littéraire," *IV Symposium Syriacum 1984: Literary Genres in Syriac Literature* (Orientalia Christiana Analecta 229; ed. H.J.W. Drijvers, et al.; Roma: Pont. Institutum Studiorum Orientalium, 1987) 183-90; D. Bundy, "Pseudepigrapha in Syriac Literature," *SBL 1991 Seminar Papers* (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1991) 759-62; M.E. Stone, *A History of the Literature of Adam and Eve* (SBLEJL 3; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1992) 90-95.

[62]Note that this syntagm (ܡܫܠܛܢܐ ܘܚܝܠܐ) parallels the supernal vocabulary of the Adam fragment (τὰς δυνάμεις καὶ τοὺς ἀγγέλους).

[63]Compare *2 Enoch* 30:11-12 (long): "... I placed him on earth, a second angel, honourable, great and glorious, and I appointed him as ruler to rule on earth ..." (*APOT* 2.449).

[64]The Syriac text does not disclose the name of the rebel angel prior to his disobedience. The Arabic version published by Bezold (p. 17 lines 4-10; see the next note) identifies him as "Satan" (الشيطان), and records that after refusing to honor Adam, his names became "Sātānāēl" (ساطانائيل) and "Iblīs" (ابليس), the latter sobriquet of course the common Qur'ānic designation for Satan. Note however Arabic *Cave of Treasures* (ed. Bezold) p. 3 line 7, where his original name would appear to be "Sātānāēl," and compare *2 Enoch* 31:4-5. Note also the additional references supplied by H.E. Gaylord, "How Satanael Lost His '-el'," *JJS* 33 (1982) 303-309. According to the *Tafsīr* of al-Ṭabarī, Iblīs was named 'Azāzīl (عزازيل) before his fall, a tradition clearly reliant upon the Enochic tale of angelic perfidy rather than the strand evidenced above. The identical tradition of Azazel's primeval rebellion would seem to be presupposed in the *Apocalypse of Abraham*; see chaps. 13-14, 20-23. For further discussion and references, see A. Netzer, "The Story of Adam in the Bereshit-Nāmah of Shāhīn," *Proceedings of the First European Conference of Iranian Studies, Part 2: Middle and New Iranian Studies* (ed. G. Gnoli and A. Panaino; Rome: Istituto italiano per il medio ed estremo oriente, 1990) 499-502; Wasserstrom, "Jewish Pseudepigrapha" 101-103.

[65]Text translated from the Western manuscript tradition presented in *La Caverne des Trésors: les deux recensions syriaques* (CSCO 486, scrip. syri t. 207; ed. Su-Min Ri; Louvain: E. Peeters, 1987) 17-23 (2.12-3.8 according to the stichometry of P. Riessler, *Altjüdisches Schrifttum ausserhalb der Bibel* [Augsburg: B. Filser Verlag, 1928] 942-1013). Compare also the eclectic edition of C. Bezold, *Die Schatzhöhle »Mĕ'ārath Gazzē«* (Leipzig, 1883-88; reprinted, Amsterdam: Philo Press, 1981) 12.7-18.7.

[66]Compare *'Abot R. Natan* A 1 (ed. Schechter 3a): רבי יהודה בן בתירה אומר אדם הראשון היה מיסב בג"ע ומלאכי השרת עומדין לקראתו וצולין לו בשר ומצננין לו יין בא נחש וראה אותו והציץ בכבודו ונתקנא בו "R. Judah b. Bathyra said: Adam the protoplast would recline in *Gan 'Eden* and the ministering angels would wait upon him, roasting meat and chilling wine for him. The serpent came and saw it, and noticed his 'glory,' and became jealous of him." The Qumran references to the eventual recovery of the כבוד אדם "glory of Adam" probably allude to Adam's original "lordly" status; cf. 1QS 4:23; CD 3:20; 1QH 17:15; note also 4Q*504* frg. 8 line 4: אדם א]בינו יצרתה בדמות כבוד[כה . Latter text and restorations cited from DJD VII 162.

[67]Heavenly entities are garbed in luminous garments—this is a leit-motif of Jewish apocalyptic tradition. See for example *2 Enoch* 9:17-19 (short): "And the Lord said to Michael, Take Enoch and take off his earthly garments, and anoint him with good oil, and clothe him in glorious garments ... and I looked at myself, and I was like one of the glorious ones, and there was no apparent difference." Translation taken from A. Pennington, "2 Enoch," *AOT* (Sparks) 337-38.

[68]There is a persistent tradition within both Jewish and Christian (especially Syriac) circles that Adam and Eve wore "garments of light" prior to their succumbing to the blandishments of the serpent. Note *Apoc. Mos.* 20:1-2: "And in that very hour my eyes were opened (i.e., when Eve partakes of the forbidden fruit), and forthwith I knew that I was bare of the righteousness with which I had been clothed ... and I wept and said to him (the serpent): 'Why hast thou done this to me in that thou hast deprived me of the glory with which I was clothed?'"; ibid. 21:6: "And to me he saith, 'O wicked woman! what have I done to thee that thou hast deprived me of the glory of God?'" (*APOT* 2.146-47); *Pirqe R. El.* 14 (ed. Luria 33b): before Adam fell, he was cloaked with "a cloud of glory" (ענן כבוד). See also *3 Apoc. Bar.* 4:16: "Know therefore, O Baruch, that as Adam through this very tree obtained condemnation, and was divested of the glory of God ..." (*APOT* 2.536); even *Apoc. Adam* 64.6-12: "When god had created me out of the earth along with Eve your mother, I went about with her in a glory which she had seen in the aeon from which we had come forth" (*Nag Hammadi Library*[3] [ed. Robinson] 279). Gen 3:21 (ויעש י אלהים לאדם ולאשתו כתנות עור וילבשם) has had some role in the spread of this motif; cf. *Tg. Onq.* and *Tg. Ps.-J.* to that verse. See also *Gen. Rab.* 20.12: בתורתו של רבי מאיר מצאו כתוב כותנות אור "In R. Meir's Torah manuscript they found written 'garments of light.'" For references to this motif within Syriac Christian literature, see S. Brock, "Some Aspects of Greek Words in Syriac," *Synkretismus im syrisch-persischen Kulturgebiet* (ed. A. Dietrich; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1975) 98-104; idem, "Jewish Traditions in Syriac Sources," *JJS* 30 (1979) 221-23; idem, *The Luminous Eye: The Spiritual World Vision of Saint Ephrem* (rev.ed.; Kalamazoo, MI: Cistercian Publications, 1992) 85-97.

[69]*Cave of Treasures* (ed. Ri) 35 (4.15-17).

[70]*Nag Hammadi Library*[3] (ed. Robinson) 279.

[71]Such an understanding could emerge from a close reading of Gen 3:22: ויאמר י אלהים הן האדם היה כאחד ממנו לדעת טוב ורע ועתה פן ישלח ידו ולקח גם מעץ החיים ואכל וחי לעלם "And God said: 'Behold, Adam is as one of us, knowing good and evil; and now, lest he stretch forth his hand and take also from the Tree of Life and eat and thus acquire

immortality ....'" Adam thus already enjoys equality with the demiurgic entities; consumption of fruit from the Tree of Life, it is implied, would elevate him above them. Consumption of this fruit is promised to the "victorious" among the church at Ephesus in Rev 2:7; comparison with the other rewards promised to the "victorious" in Revelation 2-3 demonstrates its superlative value. The concept of a heavenly Tree of Life (and concomitant Tree of Death) plays an important role in Manichaean cosmology. For a recent discussion, see J.C. Reeves, "Jewish Pseudepigrapha in Manichaean Literature: The Influence of the Enochic Library," *Tracing the Threads* (ed. Reeves) 187-91.

[72] ܫܟܠܘܢ. Note the similar transcription *šklwn* in the Middle Iranian fragments translated below, as well as the ninth-century testimony of al-Jāḥiẓ, *Kitāb al-ḥayawān* (*apud* Kessler, *Mani* 368): والاخبار عن شقلون وعن الهمامة "and narratives about Šaqlūn and Hummāmah." For the latter testimony, see now the remarks of C. Pellat, "Le témoignage d'al-Jāḥiẓ sur les manichéens," *The Islamic World From Classical to Modern Times: Essays in Honor of Bernard Lewis* (ed. C.E. Bosworth, et al.; Princeton, NJ: Darwin Press, 1989) 274. (A)šaqlūn is a transparent survival of the name "Sakla(s)," a popular designation for the demiurgic archon of classical Gnostic literature which is usually interpreted as deriving from Aramaic סכלא "fool"; cf. G. Scholem, "Jaldabaoth Reconsidered," *Mélanges d'histoire des religions offerts à Henri-Charles Puech* (Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 1974) 411; B. Barc, "Samaèl-Saklas-Yaldabaôth: recherche sur la genèse d'un mythe gnostique," *Colloque international* (ed. Barc) 123 n.4. Note especially the testimony of Michael the Syrian: ܗܠܝܢ ܕܡܢ ܣܩܠܐ ܡܠܟܐ ܕܗܝܠܐ ܐܬܘ ܘܡܢ ܐܒܪܝܠ ܐܬܘ ܐܝܟ ܕܐܡܪ ܐܢܫ ܕܡܢ ܐܕܡ ܘܚܘ

W. de Gruyter, 1969) 22 n.72; and especially H.-C. Puech, *Le manichéisme: son fondateur - sa doctrine* (Paris: Civilisations du Sud, 1949) 82-83, 175 n.342. Formerly thought to be a "local" (i.e., North African) Manichaean teaching, it is abundantly clear that the concept enjoyed wider currency. For traces of this doctrine in Sogdian and Chinese Manichaica, see S.N.C. Lieu, *Manichaeism in the Later Roman Empire and Medieval China* (2d ed.; Tübingen: Mohr, 1992) 287. See also the final lines of M 7983 I V ii: *'wd 'ymyš'n pnz'n 'mhr'spnd'n ky šhr pdyš wnyrd 'ystyd ny 'šn'synd 'wš'n 'nwd'n byšynd* (Boyce, *Reader* 74), with *Mir. Man. I* 201 n.1.

[81]Given the numerous connections with classical gnostic motifs, one might expect "Tree of Knowledge" here instead of "Tree of Life." Yet from a literary standpoint, it could be plausibly argued that Jesus himself assumes in this narrative the function of the "Tree of Knowledge." Compare *Acta Archelai* 11.1 (= Epiphanius, *Panarion* 66.29.1), where the claim is explicitly made that Manichaeans identify Jesus with the Tree of Knowledge: τὸ δὲ ἐν παραδείσῳ φυτόν ἐξ οὗ γνωρίζουσι τὸ καλόν, *αὐτός ἐστι ὁ Ἰησοῦς* <καὶ> ἡ γνῶσις αὐτοῦ, ἡ ἐν τῷ κόσμῳ; compare Epiphanius, *Panarion* 66.54.2. Text of *Acta Archelai* cited from Hegemonius, *Acta Archelai* (GCS 16; ed. C.H. Beeson; Leipzig: J.C. Hinrichs, 1906). Note also I.P. Couliano, *The Tree of Gnosis: Gnostic Mythology from Early Christianity to Modern Nihilism* (San Francisco: HarperCollins, 1992) 170.

[82]Translation modified from Reeves, *Jewish Lore* 192-93.

[83]Unlike Theodore bar Konai and kindred accounts, no proper names are provided here. Flügel suggests that the male is "desire" and the female "lust" (*Mani* 248).

[84]For the corporeal beauty of Eve, see also Irenaeus, *Adv. haer.* 1.30.7. Note Eve's epithet in the Middle Iranian tradition below: the "female one of the glories."

[85]Presumably the five "members" of the Realm of Light referred to in the previous section; see Flügel, *Mani* 249.

[86]Perhaps to be equated with Āz of the Middle Iranian sources? See below.

[87]Jesus comes alone in Theodore. Some have speculated that the anonymous "deity" who accompanies Jesus here is the "Friend of the Lights" (حبيب الانوار) mentioned earlier in Ibn al-Nadīm's account (Flügel, *Mani* 55.2). See R. Reitzenstein, *Das mandäische Buch des Herrn der Grösse und die Evangelienüberlieferung* (Heidelberg: C. Winter, 1919) 90 n.1; A.V.W. Jackson, *Researches in Manichaeism* (New York, 1932; reprinted, New York: AMS, 1965) 282.

[88]Compare M 4500 recto I lines 3-7 below, which may recount the same scene as here.

[89]The divine, or rather, demonic patrimony of Cain stems directly from a creative exegesis of Gen 4:1, which reads: והאדם ידע את חוה אשתו ותהר ותלד את קין ותאמר קניתי איש את יי. Compare *Tg. Ps.-J.* to the same verse, with the exegetical additions italicized: ואדם ידע ית חוה איתתיה דהוה חמירת למלאכא ואעדיאת ויליד ית קין ואמרת קניתי לגברא ית מלאכא דיי "And Adam knew *that* Eve his wife *was ravished by an angel*, and she became pregnant and gave birth to Cain, and exclaimed, 'I have created a man with *an angel of* the Lord.'" Note also *Pirqe R. El.* 21 (ed. Luria 48a): והאדם ידע את חוה אשתו מהו ידע שהיתה מעוברת "And Adam knew Eve his wife ... (Gen 4:1a). What is (the meaning of) 'knew'? (He knew) that she was pregnant." Prior to this statement, the cause of Eve's pregnancy is exposed: בא עליה רוכב הנחש ועברה את קין ואחר כך בעלה אדם ועברה את הבל "He came to her riding upon the serpent, and she conceived Cain, and afterwards Adam had sexual relations with her, and she conceived Abel" (text of this passage taken from the less corrupt witness preserved in *Yalq.*; see Theodor's note to *Gen. Rab.* 18.6 [1.169]). The

"he" of this passage was Sammael; cf. *Pirqe R. El.* 13 (ed. Luria 31b); *Perush Yonatan* to Gen 4:1; and the variant targum text transmitted by Recanati that Luria quotes (48a n.8): דהוה מתעברא מן סמאל מלאכא "for she was impregnated by the angel Sammael." The tradition is quite old: cf. John 8:44; 1 John 3:12 (... Κάϊν ἐκ τοῦ πονηροῦ ἦν ...); *Ap. John* 24.15-25 (where both Cain and Abel are engendered by Yaldabaoth with Eve); *Apoc. Adam* 66.25-28; Irenaeus, *Adv. haer.* 1.30.7-8; Epiphanius, *Panarion* 39.2.1-2; 40.5.3ff.; Theodore bar Konai, *Liber Scholiorum* (ed. Scher) 319-20 (on the 'Audians). For a thorough discussion, with further references, see Stroumsa, *Another Seed* 38-53. *Vita Adae et Evae* 18:4; 21:3 hint that Adam is not the father of Cain, although this is nowhere explicitly stated.

[90]According to Latin *Vita Adae et Evae* 21:3, the new-born Cain is "lucidus" ("shining"), a feature which often suggests divine filiation in these narrative contexts; compare *Apoc. Mos.* 1:3, where Cain's appellation "Adiaphotos" should probably read "Diaphotus" (Ginzberg, *Legends* 5.135 n.6). For further discussion of the motif of infantile luminosity, see below. *1 Enoch* 85:3-4 portrays Cain and Abel as "black" and "red" bulls respectively. In *Pirqe R. El.* 21, although Cain's appearance is not described, it is distinctive enough to preclude human parentage: וראתה דמותו שלא היה מן התחתונים אלא מן העליונים "and she saw that his (Cain's) appearance was not of earthly but of heavenly origin." Cain's "deformed" appearance stems from his archonic parentage, beings often depicted by classical gnostic sources as "formless" (*Trim. Prot.* 39.23-24) or even theriomorphic (*Orig. World* 100.7, 24-26; 119.17-18; *Hyp. Arch.* 87.28-29; 94.14-17; *Ap. John* 10.8-9; 11.26-34; 24.16-19; *Gos. Eg.* 57.4 [?]).

[91]The idea that Cain and Eve were involved in a sexual relationship may be connected to the obscure legend of the "first Eve." See *Gen. Rab.* 22.7 (ed. Theodor-Albeck 1.213): יהודה בר״ אמר על חוה הראשונה היו הדיינין "(What were they fighting about?) Judah in the name of R. (Judah) stated: they were contending for the 'first Eve.'" No earlier gnostic sources seem to be familiar with the "incestuous intercourse between Cain and his mother Eve" (Stroumsa, *Another Seed* 150, but see Irenaeus, *Adv. haer.* 1.30.1-2!), although the status of Cain as an archon is attested, and the motif of archonic desire for and union with Eve and other mortal women is a common one in classical gnosis. See Irenaeus, *Adv. haer.* 1.30.7; Pseudo-Tertullian, *Adv. omn. haer.* 2; Hippolytus, *Refutatio* 5.26.23; Epiphanius, *Panarion* 39.2.1-7; 40.5.3; 40.7.1.

[92]Literally "Wise (One) of the Age." Flügel suggests that she corresponds to the figure of Sophia in classical gnostic sources (*Mani* 260).

[93]Literally "Daughter of Greed."

[94]According to one tradition recounted in *Pirqe R. El.* 21, Cain and Abel each possessed a twin sister whom they married (ed. Luria 48a-b). An older tradition, already extant in *Jub.* 4:1, posited only one sister, Awan, whom Cain marries after the murder of Abel (4:9). Note also *T. Adam* 3:5, where Cain kills Abel in order to take sole possession of their sister Lebuda. The older version is also visible in *Pirqe R. El.* 21 (ed. Luria 49a): רבי צדוק אומר נכנסה קנאה ושנאה גדולה בלבו של קין על שנרצית מנחתו של הבל ולא עוד אלא שהיתה אשתו תאומתו יפה בנשים אמר אני אהרוג את הבל אחי ואקח את אשתו "R. Sadoq said: Tremendous jealousy and hatred collected in the heart of Cain because the offering of Abel was accepted, and not only this (provoked such emotions), but his (Abel's) wife who was his twin was (the most) beautiful among women. Cain thought, 'I will kill Abel my brother and take his wife for myself.'"

[95]Note the use of this phrase below in Seth's recommendation to his father regarding where they should dwell.

[96]This does not seem to be an archon, and the episode possesses a distinct non-Manichaean flavor.

[97]Literally "Go for help" and "Bring help" respectively. These are Persian names, which suggests that the source utilized by Ibn al-Nadīm stems from Iranian traditions. See Flügel, *Mani* 261-62; Stroumsa, *Another Seed* 151.

[98]Reverting to a Hebrew pun (הבל/אבל)?

[99]Here begins a series of intriguing correspondences with the narrative structure of one popular Second Temple Jewish legend about the auspicious birth of the biblical hero Noah. According to this story, the marvelous appearance and/or behavior of the infant Noah arouse his father Lamech's suspicion that the child is the fruit of an illicit liasion between his wife and an angelic being. Note the initial lines of the so-called *Genesis Apocryphon* (1QapGen): "Then I considered whether the pregnancy was due to the Watchers and Holy Ones ... and I grew perturbed about this child. Then I, Lamech, became afraid and went to Batenosh, [my wife ... saying,] 'Everything will you truthfully tell me ... you will tell me without lies ... you will speak truthfully to me and not with lies ...'" (1QapGen 2:1-7); compare *1 Enoch* 106:1-7. Similarly, when Abel beholds "his" newborn children, he immediately accuses his wife of adultery with Cain, who (it should be noted) plays the role of a heavenly archon in this Manichaean text. For other instances of Cain's archonic status, see *Ap. John* 10.34-36; 24.15-25; *Gos. Eg.* 58.[15-17]. Translations of 1QapGen are based on the textual edition of J.A. Fitzmyer, *The Genesis Apocryphon of Qumran Cave I: A Commentary* (2d rev. ed.; Rome: Biblical Institute Press, 1971).

[100]Compare 1QapGen 2:14-18: "'I swear to you by the Great Holy One, by the Ruler of Hea[ven] that this seed is yours, that this pregnancy is from you, that from you is the planting of [this] fruit ... [and that it is] not from any alien, or from any of the Watchers, or from any heavenly being ... I tell you this truthfully.'"

[101]Compare 1QapGen 2:19-21: "Then I, Lamech, ran to Methuselah, my father, and [communicated] all this to him [so that he might consult Enoch] his father, and come to know everything with certainty from him ... because they (the angels) reveal everything to him." While no reason is given for Abel's consultation with Eve, its placement here as an element of the plot suggests an ultimate dependence upon this Noachic birth-narrative.

[102]For the slaying of Abel with a rock, see *Jub.* 4:31; *Gen. Rab.* 22.8: רבנין אמרין באבן הרגו (Theodor-Albeck 1.214, and see Theodor's notes *ad loc.*); Tanḥuma, *Bereshit* §9: ... והאיך הרגו עשה לו פציעות חבורות חבורות באבן ; *Pirqe R. El.* 21: לקח אבן וטבעו במצחו של הבל והרגו (ed. Luria 49a); *Tg. Ps.-J.* Gen 4:8: וקם קין על הבל אחוהי וטבע אבנא במצחיה וקטליה ; *Cave of Treasures* (ed. Ri) 46-47 (5.29); al-Ya'qūbī, *Ta'rīkh* (*Ibn Wadih qui dicitur al-Ja'qubi historiae* ... [2 vols.; ed. M.T. Houtsma; Leiden: Brill, 1883]) 1.4 lines 10-11; al-Ṭabarī, *Ta'rīkh ar-rasul wa-l-mulūk* (*Annales quos scripsit Abu Djafar Mohammed ibn Djarir at-Tabari* [15 vols.; ed. M.J. De Goeje; reprinted, Leiden: Brill, 1964-65]) 1.138 lines 17-18.

[103]A name or designation otherwise unattested in Manichaean or heresiological sources. The word seems to mean "powerful one" or "mighty one." See the remarks of Flügel, *Mani* 262-63. Stroumsa is undoubtedly correct in viewing him as equivalent to Saklas or Ašaqlūn (*Another Seed* 149-50).

[104]*Orig. World* 123.8-11; cf. *Ap. John* 29.16-30.11, where the archons introduce humanity to various metals and the technology for their employment. Although magical arts are not specifically mentioned in the latter citation, they do form a part of the instructional curriculum in *1 Enoch* 7-8, the source which lies behind these passages. See B. Pearson, "The Figure of Seth in Manichaean Literature," *Manichaean Studies: Proceedings of the First International Conference on Manichaeism* (ed. P. Bryder; Lund: Plus Ultra, 1988) 149.

[105]Note that the archetypal Genesis narrative (Gen 2-4) has been inverted in its Manichaean analogue: the temptation and corruption of Adam now transpires *after* the story of Cain and Abel. Al-Ṣindīd thus performs the role of the serpent in the original myth.

[106]The Tree of Knowledge in the original myth.

[107]The correlation of Adam's corruption with sexual union with Eve is an ancient tradition. See Ibn Ezra *ad* Gen 3:6; *Apoc. Adam* 67.1-14; cf. *Orig. World* 119.15ff.

[108]رجلا جميلا. Compare the wording of the Syriac *Cave of Treasures* narrative of the birth of Seth (ed. Ri 49 [6.2]): ܘܝܠܕܬ ܠܗ ܫܝܬ ܓܒܪܐ ܫܦܝܪ ܕܕܡܘܬ ܐܒܘܗܝ "and she bore Seth the handsome man, a man like Adam (his father)." So too the *Book of the Bee*: ܘܝܠܕܬ ܠܗ ܫܝܬ ܫܦܝܪ ܒܕܡܘܬ ܐܒܘܗܝ "she bore Seth the handsome in the image of Adam (his father)." The latter text is cited from *The Book of the Bee* (Anecdota Oxoniensia, Semitic Series 1.2; ed. E.A.W. Budge; Oxford; Clarendon, 1886) 29 line 9.

[109]Luminosity at birth within Jewish aggadah normally marks the child so endowed as a chosen agent of God; see especially *b. Soṭa* 12a (Moses), but contrast *Vita Adae et Evae* 21:3 (Cain). Seth's radiance in this Manichaean narrative is reminiscent of the Shī'ī doctrine of the transmission of the *Nūr Muḥammadī*, according to which Muhammad's pure ancestors (among whom is numbered Seth) each radiated light from his forehead. See al-Mas'ūdī, *Murūj al-dhahab wa-ma'ādin al-jawhar: Les prairies d'or* (9 vols.; ed. C. Barbier de Meynard and P. de Courteille; Paris: Imprimerie imperiale, 1861-77) 1.68; U. Rubin, "Prophets and Progenitors in the Early Shī'a Tradition," *Jerusalem Studies in Arabic and Islam* 1 (1979) 43-45. However, an incandescent Seth is known outside of an Islamicate context; see the testimony of the Byzantine historian Cedrenus cited *apud* M.R. James, *The Lost Apocrypha of the Old Testament: Their Titles and Fragments* (London: SPCK, 1920) 9. The motif ultimately derives from an exegesis of Gen 5:1-3: Seth reflects the primal בבוד אדם, which the latter forfeited as a consequence of the "fall"; cf. *Gen. Rab.* 12.6. Unfortunately the extant lines of 1QapGen do not retain a description of the newborn Noah. Note however the appearance of Noah given in *1 Enoch* 106:2: "his body was white like snow and red like the flower of a rose, and the hair of his head (was) white like wool ... and his eyes (were) beautiful; and when he opened his eyes, he made the whole house bright like the sun so that the whole house was exceptionally bright." Translation taken from that of Knibb, *AOT* (Sparks) 314. Noah's coloration as both "white" and "red" peculiarly echos the ascription of these same colors above to Abel and Cain respectively.

[110]An obvious allusion to Gen 4:25: וידע אדם עוד את אשתו ותלד בן ותקרא את שמו שת כי שת לי אלהים זרע אחר תחת הבל כי הרגו קין .

[111]This is a puzzling response to Eve's murderous intention. However, M 528 Fragment II produces the suspicion that Ibn al-Nadīm's narrative is truncated at this point: "(R) ... he appeared before Šaqlōn, and addressed him thusly: 'Command that she give him milk immediately!' Then Šaqlōn sought to make Adam an apostate from the (correct) religion (V) ... (lacuna of approximately 20 lines) ... he saw the demons. He then quickly laid the child on the ground, and drew (around him) seven times a very wide circle, and prayed to the gods ...." We learn from this fragment that Eve had

apparently decided to kill the child by starving it. Adam thereupon appeals to Šaqlōn to force Eve to nurse the infant, unaware that the archon desires the child's demise as well. When Adam finally realizes this, he takes the child in order to feed him himself. Text of M 528 Fragment II cited from W.B. Henning, "Ein manichäisches Bet- und Beichtbuch," *APAW* 10 (Berlin, 1936) 48.

[112]Note *Homilies* 61.23, which refers in a broken context to one "crowned like Sethel." It is possible that the "crown of radiance" (اكليل البهاء) mentioned here is destined not for Adam but Seth. On the other hand, the Syriac *Cave of Treasures* explicitly records the coronation of Adam: ... "There he donned royal garments, and had placed on his head *a crown of glory* ..." (ed. Ri 19 [2.17]).

[113]This same legend of Adam's resorting to magical praxis in order to protect the young Seth from demonic attack also appears in the Middle Iranian fragments (M 5566 + M 4501) recently published by Sundermann; see below. There however Adam inscribes seven circles, as opposed to the three mentioned here. This legend must also lie behind the curious invocation preserved on Montgomery, *Aramaic Incantation Texts* #10 lines 3-4 (emended in accordance with J.N. Epstein, "Gloses babylo-araméennes," *REJ* 73 [1921] 40): בההוא חתמא דחתמה אדם קדמאה לשת ברה ואיחנטיר מן ש[ידין] ומן דיוין ומן מבכלין ומן סטנין "with that seal with which Adam the protoplast sealed his son Seth, and he (i.e., Seth) was delivered from d[emons], devils, tormentors, and satans." For further discussion, see J.C. Reeves, "Manichaica Aramaica: Adam, Seth, and Magical Praxis" (forthcoming).

[114]This episode provides an aetiological explanation for the designation "Sethel," the usual name for this personage within Syro-Mesopotamian gnostic circles. According to this tradition, the name "Sethel" (here شائل) derives from a midrashic transposition and manipulation of the consonantal phonemes of the child's original name, "Loṭis" (لوطيس).

[115]A distorted reflection of Gen 3:15a: ואיבה אשית ביניך ובין האשה ובין זרעך ובין זרעה.

[116]A reflex of Gen 3:24, wherein Adam and Eve are involuntarily expelled from the Garden. Here, by contrast, Adam and Seth voluntarily separate themselves from further temptation.

[117]According to *Vita Adae et Evae* 48:6, both Adam and Abel were buried in Paradise.

[118]I.e., the Manichaean precepts. See the discussion of Flügel, *Mani* 271; H.H. Schaeder, *Iranische Beiträge I* (reprinted, Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1972) 282-85; Puech, *Le manichéisme* 143-44 n.238.

[119]Compare the summary of the Manichaean version of the Adam and Eve narrative that is supplied by Augustine, *De morib. Manich.* 19.73: "Talis apud vos opinio de Adam et Eva: longa fabula est, sed ex ea id attingam, quod in praesentia satis est. Adam dicitis sic a parentibus suis genitum, abortivis illis principibus tenebrarum, ut maximam partem lucis haberet in anima et perexiguam gentis adversae. Qui cum sancte viveret propter exsuperantem copiam boni, commotam tamen in eo fuisse adversam illam partem, ut ad concubitum declinaretur: ita eum lapsum esse atque peccasse, sed vixisse postea sanctiorem." Text cited from Flügel, *Mani* 265-66.

[120]The *editio princeps* is F.C. Andreas and W.B. Henning, "Mitteliranische Manichaica aus Chinesisch-Turkestan, I," *SPAW* (1932) 193-201, henceforth abbreviated as *Mir. Man. I*. Revised editions of the Middle Persian text are provided in Boyce, *Reader* 71-74 (§§37-51), from which the present translation has been prepared,

and Hutter, *Manis kosmogonische Šābuhragān-Texte* 81-99. This latter work is henceforth cited as Hutter, *ŠbT*.

[121]The first human couple according to the lightly Iranized version of the Manichaean anthropogonical myth. Gēhmurd is actually the name of the Iranian *Urmensch* (Gayōmard), not the *ersten Menschen*, as is understood here. Cf. *Mir. Man. I* 197 n.2. The names "Adam" (*'d'm*) and "Eve" (*hw'y*) are employed twice below in M 2309 (= *Mir. Man. I* 191 n.2) and M 8280. Note also W. Sundermann, *Mittelpersische und parthische kosmogonische und Parabeltexte der Manichäer* (Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1973) 76 n.1 for two further fragmentary occurrences of the name "Adam." This work will henceforth be cited as Sundermann, *KuP*.

[122]For ease of reference, the translation is paragraphed in tandem with that of Boyce's *Reader*.

[123]The demoness "Greed" or "Lust," sometimes termed *m'd cy dyw'n* "mother of the demons" (Sundermann, *KuP* 63 line 1195). She is "... the covetous and pernicious principle of matter, ... the producer of the powers of darkness, and the exciter of greed and concupiscence, she is what was called Hyle by Mani himself." The description is that of Sundermann, "Some More Remarks on Mithra" 490. In the present account, she plays the role of the creator of humanity. For further information regarding her, see Jackson, *Researches* 106-108.

[124]Middle Persian *dw dys*. The fabrication of the first human couple in accordance with two gender-specific divine "forms" or "images" would seem to be grounded in a literal exegesis of Gen 1:26-27: ויאמר אלהים נעשה אדם בצלמנו כדמותנו ... ויברא אלהים את האדם בצלם אלהים ברא אתו זכר ונקבה ברא אתם . The employment of two different nouns to connote the divine "image" in 1:26, plus the repetition of the word צלם in 1:27a, may have encouraged speculation that "two forms" (*dw dys*) were required for the production of "male" and "female" (1:27b). See also Hutter, *ŠbT* 92-93 n.20.

[125]Narisah (= Mazdean Neryosang) is a messenger deity whose role here corresponds to that of the Messenger in Theodore's account, or to that of al-Bashīr in Ibn al-Nadīm. See *Mir. Man. I* 192 n.6. Theodore's discussion of Zoroastrianism has "Narsa" (نرسى) created by Hormuzd in order to thwart the evil machinations of Ahriman (*Liber Scholiorum* [ed. Scher] 297.7-12). In Zoroastrian tradition (*Bundahišn* §14), Neryosang is instrumental in preserving a portion of the spilled seed of the slain Gayōmard, the prototypical *Urmensch*. The first human couple (Mašya and Mašyāna) eventually sprout from another portion absorbed by Spandarmat (Earth). Convenient translations of the relevant portion of *Bundahišn* §14 can be found in R.C. Zaehner, *The Teachings of the Magi: A Compendium of Zoroastrian Beliefs* (reprinted, New York: Oxford University Press, 1976) 75-79; *Textual Sources for the Study of Zoroastrianism* (ed. M. Boyce; Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1984) 51-52. See also the remarks of Cumont-Kugener, *Recherches* 61-63; J. Duchesne-Guillemin, *Religion of Ancient Iran* (Bombay: Tata Press, 1973) 41, 218-20.

[126]This line is damaged; the translation follows the suggested restoration in *Mir. Man. I* 193 V I line 11.

[127]Restoration in *Mir. Man. I* 193 V I line 15. The phrase "two creatures" (*dw d'm*) consistently designates the first human couple.

[128]Apparently a reference to the emotional distress felt by the abortions subsequent to the sudden removal of the Messenger's pleasant form(s). See the initial line of Theodore bar Konai's testimony quoted above, as well as *Mir. Man. I* 192-93 R II lines

6-15. By modeling the first human couple after the forms of the Messenger, the abortions are insured constant access to those pleasurable sights.

[129]*Āsrēštār*; a class of demonic beings. The male and female *āsrēštār* correspond to Ašqalūn and Nebruel in Theodore's testimony. See *Mir. Man. I* 194 n.2. Sometimes the male *āsrēštār* is explicitly named Šaklōn (*šklwn*), an obvious reflex of the Syriac cognomen. See M 5567 below, as well as Sundermann, *KuP* 55 line 1046.

[130]This depiction betrays the classical gnostic roots of Manichaean mythology. See *Ap. John* 10.8-9; *Hyp. Arch.* 94.14-17; *Orig. World* 100.7, 24-26. On the popularity of the lion-image in Manichaean demonology, see Baur, *Das manichäische Religionssystem* 57-59.

[131]Compare the language of M 7800 cited above: "Thereupon the Enthymesis of Death, the Greed (i.e., Āz) dressed in the two abortion demons, Šaqlūn and Pēsūs ...."

[132]The original inhabitants of the Realm of Darkness prior to the mingling of Light and Darkness; cf. *Mir. Man. I* 194 n.3.

[133]A different set of demons, monsters, etc. who are often referred to in parallel accounts (such as Theodore's above) as "abortions." The didactic activity of Āz is thus consistent with her original nature as a primal expression of Lust or Greed.

[134]Middle Persian *'wzdh'g*; compare New Persian اژدها ; "dragon"; اژدهاك "Aždahāk."

[135]A plausible textual emendation; see *Mir. Man. I* 195 n.2; Boyce, *Reader* 72.

[136]Middle Persian *dyswys*, literally "mixture," referring here to the unsanctioned mingling of Light and Darkness. See *Mir. Man. I* 195 n.4; Sundermann, *KuP* 15 n.12; Hutter, *ŠbT* 99-100.

[137]See Henning, *BSOAS* 11 (1943-46) 63 n.1.

[138]Compare above Ibn al-Nadīm, *Fihrist* (*apud* Flügel, *Mani* 58-59): قال فلما رأى الملاءكة الخمسة نور الله وطيبه الذى استلبه الحرص واسره فى ذينك المولودين "He (Mani) said, 'When the five angels saw the divine Light and Goodness which Desire had plundered and bound as captive within those two who had been born ...." Cf. Bousset, *Hauptprobleme* 49-50.

[139]See *Acta Archelai* 8.3 (= Epiphanius, *Panarion* 66.26.3): καὶ ἡ ὕλη ἀφ' ἑαυτῆς ἔκτισε τὰ φυτά, καὶ συλωμένων αὐτῶν ἀπό τινων ἀρχόντων ...; Theodore bar Konai, *Liber Scholiorum* (ed. Scher) 317.3-6: ܗܝ ,ܗܘ ܕܚܫܟܐ ܕܚܠܡܐ ܥܡ ܒܢܝ ܚܫܟܐ ܕܐܬܓܠܝ ܠܗ ܒܪܢܫ

[155]A reflex of the serpent in the Genesis narrative? Note also the references to the dispersal or binding of Adam's guardian(s) in the Syriac and Arabic traditions cited above.

[156]*pnz'n 'mhr'spnd'n*; literally "five Amahraspands"; compare Sundermann, *KuP* 15 lines 48-49: *mhr'spndn rwšn'n* "Light Elements." Whereas in Zoroastrianism the Amahraspands, or "Holy Immortals," are conceived as lesser deities (usually six in number) who assist Ahura Mazda in the creation of the physical universe, the term is employed here to denote the "five elements" of the Realm of Light that constituted the battle-armor of Primal Man. When the latter entity was defeated by the forces of the Realm of Darkness during their initial engagement, the hosts of Darkness consumed his armor, thereby ingesting the "five elements." The eventual recovery of these "elements" is the goal of Manichaean cosmogony.

[157]For other translations of this passage, see *Mir. Man. I* 193-201; J.P. Asmussen, *Manichaean Literature* (Delmar, NY: Scholars Facsimiles and Reprints, 1975) 128-31; Klimkeit, *Gnosis* 232-34; Hutter, *ŠbT* 81-104.

[158]Sundermann, *KuP* 70-77. As Sundermann indicates (p. 70), the contents of these fragments closely parallel the material found in Ibn al-Nadīm's narrative recounting the Manichaean version of the story of Adam and Eve. They thus confirm the essential veracity of his testimony.

[159]*hmwys'n*. See W.B. Henning, "A List of Middle-Persian and Parthian Words," *BSOS* 9 (1937-39) 83.

[160]Compare Ibn al-Nadīm above: "Then that (male) archon came back to his daughter, who was Eve, and lustfully had intercourse with her."

[161]Sundermann (*KuP* 71 n.2) suggests that Gēhmurd is the speaker.

[162]A reference to the garland-scene recounted by Ibn al-Nadīm above? Compare that narrative: "Al-Ṣindīd then taught Eve magical syllables in order that she might infatuate Adam. She proceeded to act (by) presenting him with a garland from a flowering tree, and when Adam saw her, he lustfully united with her." For the meaning of Middle Persian *j'dwgy*, see Henning, *BSOS* 9 (1937-39) 83.

[163]Middle Persian *qš*. See the remarks of Sundermann, *KuP* 127.

[164]The child is of course Seth. The *Fihrist* account speaks of only three circles.

[165]In the *Fihrist*, it is the names of the King of the Gardens, Primal Man, and the Living Spirit.

[166]In addition to the *Fihrist* account and the possible Aramaic incantation bowl reflex, this episode possesses a Sogdian parallel (M 528); see Henning, "Bet- und Beichtbuch" 47-48. For comparative evidence, see I. Gruenwald, *Apocalyptic and Merkavah Mysticism* (Leiden: Brill, 1980) 185 and his n.15.

[167]Middle Persian *rb'y'nd*, > *rbwdn*. See Henning, *BSOS* 9 (1937-39) 87.

[168]Literally "the Upper Height" (*b'ryst 'brdr*).

[169]This threatening episode is severely truncated in the *Fihrist* narrative.

[170]Compare Ibn al-Nadīm: "Then there appeared to Adam a tree called the lotus, and milk flowed from it, and he fed the boy with it."

[171]To judge from the similar movement of the *Fihrist*'s narrative, the naming of Seth probably occurred here.

[172]According to the *Fihrist* version, Eve resolves to kill Seth at the behest of al-Ṣindīd, but Adam rescues the child before any harm can come to him. Perhaps this Middle Iranian version supplied information about one or more assassination attempts.

[173]*'rd'yy*. This term is equivalent to *ṣiddīqūt* above in the *Fihrist*. This apparently refers to the time when Adam and Eve were first created. Jesus warns Adam to avoid Eve's company, and initially (at least) he enjoys success.

[174]Note the wording of Recto column I lines 7-8.

[175]See Sundermann, *KuP* 74 n.11.

[176]Here Eve becomes a willing accomplice in the seduction of Adam. Perhaps this is the setting for Eve's instruction in magical syllables.

[177]Compare Ibn al-Nadīm above: "When Shāthil saw him, he admonished and rebuked him (Adam), and said to him, '*Arise, let us go to the East*, to the Light and Wisdom of God.'"

[178]Identified by Sundermann as the "fifth earth"; Manichaean cosmology characteristically posits "eight earths" and "ten heavens." See Sundermann, *KuP* 38 n.3; 57 line 1060.

[179]See §41 above?

[180]I.e., from the precepts of Manichaeism.

CHAPTER FOUR

THE APOCALYPSE OF SETHEL

Text

ὁμοίως δὲ καὶ Σηθὴλ ὁ υἱὸς αὐτοῦ οὕτω γέγραφεν ἐν τῇ ἀποκαλύψει αὐτοῦ λέγων ὅτι ἤνοιξα τοὺς ὀφθαλμούς μου καὶ ἐθεώρησα ἔμπροσθεν τοῦ προσώπου μου [ἄγγε]λον οὗ οὐκ ἠδυνά[μην ἀναζω]γραφῆσαι τὸ [φέγγος ..... ἄ]λλο τι ὑ[..... ..... ἀστ]ραπαὶ [..... ....] μοι· [..... ....] ου ὁ[..... ....] αι [..... ....] ε[..... ....· ὁπη]νίκα τούτων ἠκροασάμην, ἐχάρη μου ἡ καρδία καὶ μετετράπη ἡ φρόνησις καὶ ἐγενόμην ὡς εἷς τῶν μεγίστων ἀγγέλων. ἐκεῖνος ὁ ἄγγελος τὴν χεῖρα αὐτοῦ ἐπὶ τὴν δεξιάν μου θεὶς καὶ ἐξέωσέ με ἀπὸ τοῦ κόσμου ἐξ οὗ ἐγεννήθην καὶ ἀπήνεγκεν εἰς ἕτερον τόπον πάνυ μέγιστον. ἤκουον δὲ ἐκ τῶν ὄπισθέν μου θορύβου μεγίστου ἐκ τῶν ἀγγέλων ἐκείνων ὧν κα[τέ]λειψ[α ἐν] τῷ κόσμ[ῳ αὐτῶν ὑπαρ]χόντων [καὶ .... ν]των. ἰδ[ὼν δὲ .... ἀν]θρω[π----- at least two lines missing]. π[ολλὰ δὲ τούτοις παρα]πλήσια ἐλέχθη ἐν ταῖς γραφαῖς αὐτοῦ, καὶ ὡς ἡρπάγη ὑπ' ἐκείνου τοῦ ἀγγέλου ἀπὸ κόσμου εἰς κόσμον καὶ ἀπεκάλυψεν αὐτῷ μέγιστα μυστήρια τῆς μεγαλωσύνης.[1]

Translation

Also Sethel his son has similarly written in his apocalypse, saying that 'I opened my eyes and beheld before me an [ang]el whose [radiance] I am unable to (adequately) represent ... ... [lig]htning ... ... to me ... (3 lines lost) ... [Wh]en I heard these things, my heart rejoiced and my mind changed and I became like one of the greatest angels. That angel placed his hand upon my right (hand) and took me out of the world wherein I was born and brought me to another place (that was) exceedingly great. Behind me I heard a loud uproar from those angels whom [I l]eft behind [in] the world which the[y pos]sessed ... (at least 2 lines missing) ...'

M[any things simil]ar to these are described in his writings, and as he was transported by that angel from world to world, he revealed to him the awesome secrets of (divine) majesty.

Commentary

ὁμοίως δὲ καὶ Σηθὴλ ὁ υἱὸς αὐτοῦ οὕτω γέγραφεν ἐν τῇ ἀποκαλύψει αὐτοῦ "Also Sethel his son has similarly written in his apocalypse." The employment of the name "Sethel" in lieu of "Seth" is a peculiar characteristic of both Manichaean and Mandaean literature. In the present fragment, the use of the phrase "his (i.e., Adam's) son" (ὁ υἱὸς αὐτοῦ) to modify the name "Sethel" echoes the manner in which this figure is typically introduced in Syro-Mesopotamian gnostic literature when speaking of biblical genealogical succession.[2] It assures the uninitiated reader that the biblical forefather Seth (Gen 4:25-26; 5:3-8; 1 Chr 1:1; Luke 3:38) and the personage termed Sethel who occupies an identical position in the chain of ancestors are in fact one and the same. Given the frequent use of the epithet "his son" or even "his firstborn son" in tandem with the proper name, one might speculate that the use of the name "Sethel" for this forefather was a relatively recent innovation which required occasional verbal reinforcement. Caution however must temper such speculation, for an individual named "Sethel the deacon" already appears among Mani's earliest circle of disciples.[3] The name is thus in use in Mesopotamia during the mid-third century; how much earlier this was the case remains obscure.

The origin of the designation "Sethel" is also unclear. One interpretation understands "Sethel" to be a theophoric formation,[4] perhaps constructed to enhance its referent's standing as an entity created "in the image and likeness of God" (Gen 5:3) who, unlike his father, never forfeited that status. Structurally the name appears to consist of the proper name "Seth" plus a variant of the popular Semitic angelic termination (*i*)*'ēl*.[5] The fact that the present "apocalypse" explicitly mentions his elevation to angelic status (51.1-6) lends credence to this hypothesis. Such an analysis is reinforced by the occurrence of the figure of a "heavenly Seth" as a divine being within so-called Sethian gnosticism, although within that trajectory the name "Sethel" does not appear. An analogous conception of an exalted Seth, perhaps dependent upon this idea, does play a role in Mandaeism[6] and in certain strands of Manichaean tradition. Although the name Sethel designates within these latter traditions the biological son of Adam,[7] it can simultaneously connote a heavenly entity to whom prayers and hymns of praise might be addressed. For example, *Psalm-Book* 144.1-146.13 features a hymn extolling "Sethel our Savior," wherein a supernal Sethel, termed "the giver of life to souls," is successively lauded by the constituent deities and personified components of the Manichaean cosmos, by the Manichaean apostles (including Mani himself), and finally the members of the Manichaean community. Here the name "Sethel" would appear to denote the Light-*Nous*,

or the heavenly Apostle of Light, the celestial entity that has repeatedly manifested itself upon earth in the figures of the heralds. This concept is thus akin to the aforementioned idea found in certain classical gnostic compositions that posits a "heavenly Seth" as the ultimate revealer of gnosis or as an "angelic" savior-figure.

An alternative way of analyzing the development of the name "Sethel" has recently been posited by G.G. Stroumsa. Rather than viewing "Sethel" as a theophoric formation, Stroumsa points to several midrashic word-plays that treat the name "Sethel" as if it were derived from the Hebrew root שתל "to plant."[8] The ultimate origin of this exegesis was a creative reading of the Hebrew text of Gen 4:25: וידע אדם עוד את אשתו ותלד בן ותקרא את שמו שת כי שת לי אלהים זרע אחר תחת הבל כי הרגו קין "And Adam knew his wife again, and she bore a son. She named him Seth, 'because God has granted me another seed in place of Abel, whom Cain killed.'" By reading the crucial phrase שת לי as one word (שתלי) and translating the clause in a literal fashion, the result is: "she named him Seth, 'because God planted (for) me another seed ....'" Seth thereby acquired the by-name שתיל, ܫܬܝܠ (i.e., "the one planted," or simply "plant"), passive forms of the same verbal root as generated in Aramaic and Syriac.

Despite its ingenuity, there remain certain problems with this proposal. The Hebrew sources which illustrate the "planting" metaphor in conjunction with Seth are late and obscure, whereas the name "Sethel" is demonstrably in use by the mid-third century. Stroumsa suggests that the derivation of "Sethel" from שתל may have been known to Philo, but the relevant citations (*Post. Cain.* 10, 170; *Quaest. Gen.* 1.78) are extremely ambiguous. His citation of Mandaean examples only demonstrates that the Mandaeans themselves were perfectly capable of perceiving the midrashic possibilities inherent in a form like "Šitil"[9]—the root was after all a common one in Aramaic dialects; it proves nothing about the ultimate generation of the form.

More puzzling is Stroumsa's appeal to the Manichaean protoplastic narrative preserved by Ibn al-Nadīm in the latter's *Fihrist* as a further possible example of knowledge about the "plant" derivation. In the section that recounts the naming of Seth, we read: "Then there appeared to Adam a tree called the lotus, and milk flowed from it, and he fed the boy with it. He named him (the boy) after its name, but sometime later he renamed him Shāthil (i.e., Seth)."[10] Stroumsa concludes: "Since the Manichaean source clearly linked the child's name to the growing of the tree, it probably reflected the same Hebrew etymology (from the root שתל) already known to the Rabbis and perhaps to Philo."[11] But this explanation disregards the plain meaning of the text. It only states that Adam initially named the child "*Lxtxs*" in order to commemorate the miraculous suckling of the child with the tree's sap. Afterwards he reversed the consonants of the boy's name to form the name "*Sxtxl*" (i.e., Shāthil). In other words, according to Ibn al-Nadīm, the name Sethel derives from a midrashic rearrangement and manipulation of the consonants of the word "lotus,"[12] the tree whose sap initially nourished the infant Seth. Neither the root שתל nor the concept of

"one planted" play any discernible role in the construction of this particular explanation, which simply functions as an aetiological explanation for the curious designation "Sethel."

There remains a third possibility for reconstructing the origin of the curious designation "Sethel." Perhaps the impetus for orthographic variance was supplied by a homiletic desire to create a homophonic symmetry or assonance among the names of the three biblical sons of Adam. Such an explanation is not as fantastic as it might initially seem. The names of the first two sons, Cain and Abel, are in fact so harmonized in Muslim tradition, appearing there under the forms Qābīl and Hābīl.[13] The "-el" termination of Sethel may thus not be the angelic suffix of the theophoric name theory, but rather may reflect the residue of an attempt to reproduce the biblical orthography of the name "Abel" (הבל).[14] Perhaps this harmonization process, which is of uncertain age and origin,[15] was extended to embrace the remaining biblical son of Adam, thus producing the series Qābīl, Hābīl, and Šāthīl (Sethel).

In addition to the enigmatic designation "Sethel," the forefather Seth also bore in certain gnostic circles the name "Allogenes" (Ἀλλογενής); literally, "the stranger" or "the alien." It stems apparently from a Greek gloss to the literal Septuagintal rendering of the Hebrew זרע אחר of Gen 4:25, σπέρμα ἕτερον ("another seed"), a phrase understood exegetically as ἀλλογενής ("alien") to emphasize both Seth's "alien" status amidst a corrupt material creation and the distinctiveness of his parentage *vis-à-vis* an alleged demonic patrimony for Cain and Abel.[16] In the course of his discussion of the Archontic sect (*Panarion* 40), Epiphanius provides the following pertinent testimony:

> They (the Archontics) also use the work called *The Strangers*—for there are books entitled thus ... These folk recount another tale, according to which, they say, the devil came to Eve and united with her as a man with a woman and begot on her Cain and Abel ... and in turn, they say, Adam united with Eve his wife and begot Seth, his own physical son. And next, they say, the higher power descended, accompanied by the ministering angels of the good god, and caught up Seth himself, whom they also call "Allogenes"; carried him somewhere above and cared for him for a while, so that he would not be slain; and after a long time brought him back down into this world, having rendered him spiritual and (only) <apparently> physical, so that neither <the creator> nor the authorities and realms of the world-creating god could prevail over him. And they say that he no longer served the maker and craftsman (of the world); but he acknowledged the unnameable power and the higher, good god, serving the latter; and that he revealed many things to the discredit of the maker of the world, the rulers, and the authorities. <Hence> they have also portrayed certain books, some written in the name of Seth and others written in the name of Seth and his seven sons, as having been given by him. For they say that he bore seven <sons>, called "strangers"—as we noted in the case of other schools of thought, viz. gnostics and Sethians.[17]

This passage is of paramount importance for the interpretation, and perhaps even the sectarian provenance, of our present "apocalypse" of Sethel. In addition to the notice about the distinctive sectarian nomenclature for

Seth (and his progeny), we also learn that the Archontics accorded Seth, instead of Cain and/or Abel, recognition as the first biological descendant of Adam and Eve. Seth subsequently experienced a corporeal transformation at the hands of "the higher power," a process which involved both heavenly ascent and a temporary occultation. He ultimately returned to earth, but in a non-physical form that was immune to the blandishments of the demiurgic archons, and revealed to his contemporaries valuable information about the supernal realms. The Archontics utilized a number of literary works attributed to Seth which presumably were based upon the teachings that he allegedly promulgated upon his return from heaven.

The obvious similarity between Epiphanius' outline of Archontic ideology and the surviving contents of our fragment suggests that the *CMC* "apocalypse of Sethel" belongs within the orbit of this particular sectarian milieu. However, certain difficulties attend a firmer resolution of this possible nexus. Some scholars have questioned the actual existence of a separate sect of so-called "Archontics," since it is only Epiphanius, along with those writers dependent upon his work, that record this name. Moreover, given the numerous correspondences discernible within the information that he supplies about the "Archontics" (*Panarion* 40) and the "Sethians" (*Panarion* 39), as well as certain antinomian "Gnostics" (*Panarion* 26), and given the prominence of what is presumably the same "Sethian" group in the writings of earlier heresiologists, it may be possible to argue that the Archontics were simply a "local" branch of the broader movement that scholars term "Sethian gnosticism."[18] Epiphanius himself informs us that the Archontics "were not commonly found in many places, only in the province of Palestine. Yet they have already somehow carried their poison into Greater Armenia."[19] He attributes its Palestinian roots to the perfidy of a certain hermit named Peter who dwelt in a cave near Hebron, and its eastern expansion to one Eutaktos, an Armenian traveler who after imbibing the "poison" of Peter subsequently infected his homeland (*Panarion* 40.1.2-3).

Independent evidence for the spread of "Sethian" (Archontic?) writings and doctrines into northern Mesopotamia occurs in the *Scholion* of Theodore bar Konai during his discussion of the Edessene heretic 'Audi and his followers. The significance of this testimony for the eastern promulgation of Sethian currents, which was first recognized by H.-C. Puech,[20] requires that we reproduce the report in its entirety:

> **Regarding the 'Audians:**[21]
> 'Audi was leader of the deacons of the church in Edessa, (an office) usually termed 'archdeacon.' When the Nicene Council decreed the regulation that members of the Church would not celebrate the paschal festival with the Jews, he (continued) to follow the ancient customs, and contended that their rite was the proper one to hold. He (therefore) separated himself from the Church, and formed a group from those who agreed with him. And when he saw that he was being blamed by many for opposing the decision of the synod, he added another (reason) in order that he might seem to possess a pretext, saying that it was due to the dissoluteness of the clergy, for they collected interest upon loans and dwelt with women and committed adultery and frequented brothels—'for this reason I separated from them.' Yet it is well known that he was both headstrong

and boastful—headstrong because he violated a canonical decree of the Church, and boastful because he was infected by the disease of Pharisaic pride, for he deemed himself to be more righteous than the rest (of the Church).
He accepted with the Old and the New Testaments also (certain) apocalypses ( ). He asserted that Light and Darkness were not created by God, and he taught that God was composite and possessed in all respects the appearance of a human being. He thinks this follows from the verse which states: 'Let us make humankind in our image and in our likeness' (Gen 1:26). Since the Scriptures use concrete (?) nouns about him (God), they seek to relate his manifestations and his activities.[22]
Let us record (here) a small sample of the wickedness of 'Audi. Writing in an apocalypse which bears the name of Abraham,[23] one of the creators speaks thusly: 'The world and the created order were made by Darkness and[24] six other powers.' It says moreover: 'They beheld by how many divinities the soul is purified, and by how many divinities the body was formed.' It says further: 'They asked, "Who compelled the angels and powers to form the body?"' And in an apocalypse attributed to John,[25] it says: '(As for) those rulers that I saw, my body was created by them,' and it lists the names of the holy creators, when it says, 'My wisdom created flesh, understanding[26] created skin, Elohim created bones, my kingdom created blood, Adonai created nerves, anger created hair,[27] and thought created the brain.'[28] This (material) was taken from Chaldean doctrines.

How he reviles God by (ascribing to him) a sexual relationship with Eve:

It states in the *Book of the Strangers* ( ) with regard to the character of God: 'God said to Eve, "Conceive a child with me before the creators of Adam come to you!"' And the rulers say in the *Book of Questions*: 'Come, let us lie with Eve, for that one who is born will be ours!' It goes on to say that 'the rulers led Eve (away) and lay with her so that she could not come to Adam.' And the rulers say, according to the *Apocalypse of the Strangers* ( ), 'Come, let us cast our seed in her,[29] and let us do it with her first so that the one who will be born from her will be under our control.' And it says moreover: 'They led Eve away from Adam's presence and had sexual intercourse with her.'
Such are the polluted (doctrines) and wicked (teachings) which 'Audi the perverted one[30] has produced against God, the angels, and the world!

This important testimony provides us with not only the titles of some of the "apocalypses" used by the 'Audians, but also a selection of quotations allegedly copied from these works. It is readily apparent that the information Theodore provides us is closely related to that contained in Epiphanius' report about the Archontics. Both sects relied upon certain apocryphal "books" or "apocalypses" which were nominally connected with the forefather Seth and his descendents through the employment of the by-name "Stranger(s)" (Ἀλλογενής, Ἀλλογενεῖς,), the latter designation simply being a Syriac rendering of the Greek gloss. Both sects also embraced that strand of Jewish tradition which interpreted Gen 4:1 as implying the impregnation of Eve by a divine entity, identified there usually as Sammael. Cain and Abel are thus not Adam's "seed"; they are the progeny, the "seed" of diabolic archons. Or, as the *Apocalypse of the Strangers* states in its 'Audian recension: "Come, let us cast *our seed* in her, and let us do it with

her first *so that the one who will be born from her* will be under our control."[31] The crucial phrase in this exhortation is "our seed" ( ), presumably deliberately constructed to echo the ("another seed") of Gen 4:25 (Peshitta) that signals the unique status of Seth.

The *CMC* "apocalypse of Sethel" does not provide any passages that pertain to the circumstances surrounding the birth of the alleged author. Similarly, the citations from the *Book* or *Apocalypse of the Strangers* which Theodore preserves do not indicate whether the work eventually discussed the subsequent fortunes of Seth and his progeny, although the title would seem to suggest that the book featured such a treatment. Moreover, the summary of experiences recounted by Epiphanius, a discussion that is apparently based upon the Archontic library of Sethian compositions, which is in turn related in some fashion to the 'Audian apocalypse, possesses several points of correspondence with the paltry remains of the *CMC* apocalypse. These overlaps will receive further attention as we proceed through the commentary.

λέγων ὅτι ἤνοιξα τοὺς ὀφθαλμούς μου καὶ ἐθεώρησα ἔμπροσθεν τοῦ προσώπου μου [ἄγγε]λον οὗ οὐκ ἠδυνά[μην ἀναζω]γραφῆσαι τὸ [φέγγος ..... ἄ]λλο τι ὑ[..... ..... ἀστ] ραπαὶ [..... ....] μοι· [..... ....] "saying that 'I opened my eyes and beheld before me an [ang]el whose [radiance] I am unable to (adequately) represent ... ... [lig]htning ... ... to me ... (3 lines lost)." As we have previously seen, the use of Greek ὅτι to introduce direct discourse probably reflects the similar employment of Syriac ܕ in analogous contexts in that language. It is one of the many linguistic features displayed by the *Codex* that suggests a secondary translation from an eastern Semitic source.

The initial quotations from the "apocalypse of Sethel" are unfortunately badly preserved. There is enough however to permit a reconstruction of at least the broad outlines of the narrative. The citation opens with what appears to be a description of an angelophany experienced by Sethel. While the word for "angel" has been largely reconstructed by the editors at this juncture, its restoration is virtually certain, since 51.6 and 52.3-4 subsequently refer to "that angel" (ἐκεῖνος ὁ ἄγγελος, ἐκείνου τοῦ ἀγγέλου). The luminosity of the angel which Sethel beholds is so intense that he gropes for the precise words to express its qualities, finally (apparently) settling on the meteorological phenomenon of "lightning-flashes."[32] This metaphor is not an uncommon one in biblical hierophanic discourse. Daniel (10:6) sees a figure whose face "was like the appearance of lightning" (כמראה ברק); similarly, the women who visit the tomb of Jesus behold an angel ἦν δὲ ἡ εἰδέα αὐτοῦ ὡς ἀστραπή "whose appearance was like lightning" (Matt 28:3). Ezekiel also witnesses the flashing of lightning accompanying the sight of the celestial retinue during the course of his so-called "chariot-vision": ודמות החיות מראיהם כגחלי אש בערות כמראה הלפדים היא מתהלכת בין החיות ונגה לאש ומן האש יוצא ברק והחיות רצוא ושוב כמראה הבזק "and (as for) the form of the beasts, their appearance was like that of burning coals of fire; like the sight of torches it (the fire) was moving among the beasts, and the fire was brilliant, and from the fire spewed forth lightning. And the beasts flitted to and fro like lightning" (Ezek

1:13-14).[33] According to the *Codex*, Mani himself was even privy to an angelophany that "once c[ame ?] in the manner of lightning ...."[34]

Unlike the fragments of the apocalypses of Adam and Enoch that are cited in the *Codex*, the apocalypse of Sethel does not preserve the name of the angel who appears before the forefather. Given the extensive lacunae in these opening lines, it is certainly possible that a proper name might have originally figured in this passage,[35] although if such were the case it would seem unlikely that the angel would simply be termed "that angel" two subsequent times in the apocalypse. The better preserved apocalypses of Enosh and Shem maintain the anonymity of their respective angelic interlocutors, but this feature is perhaps due to the relative paucity of aggadic development, both Jewish and Christian, around those figures. By contrast, there are extensive extrabiblical literary traditions which link one or more specific angels with the careers of Adam and Enoch, and it is thus hardly surprising that their name(s) occur(s) in their alleged apocalypses. Since the postbiblical treatment of Seth is demonstrably much more complex than the development afforded his father or his immediate descendants, it remains unclear which, if any, angel would be specifically associated with this particular forefather.

Finally, the initial phrase "I opened my eyes and beheld before me ..." (ἤνοιξα τοὺς ὀφθαλμούς μου καὶ ἐθεώρησα ἔμπροσθεν τοῦ προσώπου μου) is a rather peculiar expression in this context, possessing no precise parallels in biblical literature. Hierophanies there typically involve a process of prolonged ocular focus ("I beheld in my dream ... I continued watching my dream ..."),[36] or at least the movement of the seer's attention from one focal point to another ("I lifted my eyes and saw ..."),[37] The phrase in question suggests, however, that Sethel's eyes were previously shut. Possibly Sethel was asleep, and he was awakened by his angelic visitor, much as Jesus the Splendor rouses the sleeping Adam in the Manichaean anthropogony.[38] Alternatively, the phrase may refer to a "metaphorical" or "spiritual" opening of Sethel's eyes; that is, he now can perceive supernatural verities that were previously invisible to him. A possible parallel to this type of "sight" occurs in Gen 21:19, where Hagar is "shown" a source of water that will preserve the lives of herself and her son: ויפקח אלהים את עיניה ותרא באר מים "and God opened her eyes, and she saw a well of water." As the medieval commentator Sforno acutely notes, "God granted her the insight to recognize the spot where water was, for she was hardly blind prior to this (episode)."[39] Similarly, when Elisha and his servant were seemingly doomed to fall prey to a vengeful force of Aramaean warriors, Elisha calmed the frightened youth with a temporary experience of the gift of "spiritual sight": ויתפלל אלישע ויאמר יי פקח נא את עיניו וירא ויפקח יי את עיני הנער וירא והנה ההר מלא סוסים ורכב אש סביבות אלישע "and Elisha prayed and said, 'Lord, open his eyes that he might see,' and God opened the eyes of the lad, and he looked and behold, the mountain was filled with fiery horses and chariotry encompassing Elisha" (2 Kgs 6:17). In the present case, the absence of a clear context precludes a firm resolution of this issue.

... ὁπη]νίκα τούτων ἠκροασάμην, ἐχάρη μου ἡ καρδία καὶ μετετράπη ἡ φρόνησις καὶ ἐγενόμην ὡς εἷς τῶν μεγίστων ἀγγέλων "... [Wh]en I heard these things, my heart rejoiced and my mind changed and I became like one of the greatest angels." At least three lines have completely perished immediately before Sethel's statement. If the modern editors are correct in their surmise that 50.19 should be restored to read [ἔφη δέ] μοι,[40] the missing lines featured the actual message communicated by the angel to Sethel. Only the response of Sethel to the angelic pronouncement survives.

This passage indicates that Sethel underwent a transformation from human to angelic status. We have already encountered a similar motif in the surviving fragments of the *CMC* "apocalypse" of Adam, wherein Adam "was made superior to all the powers and angels of creation" (*CMC* 50.1-4). In the latter instance, Adam's transformation seemed to be linked to certain traditions regarding his original lofty stature within the divine world as the image of God, a position which he forfeited by his disobedience in the Garden, but which he eventually regained in the World to Come.[41] Seth's transformation is indebted to a certain extent to the same motif, since Gen 5:3 explicitly states that he too bore "his (i.e., God's) image and likeness."[42] Yet a significant gulf separates the experiences of Adam and Seth. Adam lost his status as "image," but it was ultimately restored to him: a portrayal of his reinstatement via the imagery of metamorphosis and elevation seems entirely appropriate. However, at least according to the traditional narratives, Seth never relinquishes his status as "image and likeness," and in fact must be viewed as the conduit of this particular attribute to subsequent generations of humanity.[43] He does not require rehabilitation. Thus a transformation-story featuring Seth as protagonist must possess a deeper rationale.

Gnostic exegetes detected a disturbing textual tension within the terse biblical narrative regarding Seth. On the one hand, Seth was the biological son of Adam and Eve, engendered through their sexual intercourse (Gen 4:25). For gnostic interpreters, who disparaged sexuality and procreation as degenerate activities devised by the demiurgic archons, his body was therefore a material entity, fully subject to the corrupt whims of the demiurgic archons, the actual fashioners of Adam and Eve (Gen 1:26-27). Yet, on the other hand, the biblical narrative explicitly asserts that Seth was not simply a human being. He was literally "*another* seed" (also Gen 4:25); that is to say from the gnostic perspective, "not of the seed of the archons" like Cain and Abel, his older brothers.[44] From whose "seed" then does Seth materialize? According to the Bible, it is undoubtedly Adam's. Gnostic exegesis also seems to accept this patrimony,[45] even though some trajectories at least toy with the notion that celestial entities normally resident in the pleroma are involved in the production of Seth.[46] Since the biblical narrative sequence dictates the physical engendering of Seth *after* the corruption of Adam, the "image" must be re-implanted within humanity by the deity(s). Therefore while Adam may indeed be responsible for the body of Seth, the "image" associated with Seth (and originally Adam) derives from the heavenly realm. Like his putative progenitor, Seth combines within his person two disparate qualities: he is a corporeal being who bears the "image" of God. This status

reinstates the hybrid position that Adam occupies prior to his own disobedience and subsequent forfeiture of the "image."

Given this circumstance, Seth is potentially subject to the same corruptive forces that overwhelmed his father. What is worse—the demiurgic archons are now cognizant of the existence of an alien presence within their world, one that is striving to thwart and ultimately overturn material creation. The archons are keenly aware that Seth is the current physical representative of that supernal infiltration; he is recognizably "another seed," ἀλλογενής. Grave perils thus threaten Seth as long as he retains his present condition of vulnerability.

Illustrative of this type of narrative exegesis is the aforementioned testimony of Epiphanius regarding the teachings of the so-called Archontics about Seth:

> And in turn, they say, Adam united with Eve his wife and begot Seth, his own physical son. And next, they say, the higher power descended, accompanied by the ministering angels of the good god, and caught up Seth himself ... carried him somewhere above and cared for him for a while, *so that he would not be slain*; and after a long time brought him back down into this world, *having rendered him spiritual and (only) <apparently> physical, so that neither <the creator> nor the authorities and realms of the world-creating god could prevail over him.*[47]

This valuable report actually resolves at least two distinct conundra embedded within the surviving fragments of the *Codex* "apocalypse" of Sethel. First, as the immediately following fragments of this "apocalypse" express it, Seth was transported bodily from earth "to another place (that was) exceedingly great" (51.11-12) via the agency of an anonymous angel. His sudden removal produced much consternation among "those angels whom [I] left behind *in the world which [they possessed.*" (51.15-18). These latter "angels," as their epithet makes clear, are none other than the scheming demiurgic archons mentioned by Epiphanius above (the creator, authorities, realms). Moreover, their tantrum becomes intelligible: they realize that Seth has escaped (at least temporarily) their clutches. If Epiphanius' information about the teachings of the Archontics is to be trusted, it would appear that Seth risked assassination by the archons or one of their human agents as long as he remained in the material world. While the "apocalypse" fragments presented herein are silent regarding this specific threat, it is surely interesting to observe that a largely identical tradition concerning a plot by the archons to kill the forefather Seth survives in the tenth-century Muslim encyclopaedist Ibn al-Nadīm's collection of Manichaean legends,[48] as well as in the Aramaic incantation bowl tradition[49] and in Middle Iranian sources.[50]

Second, and perhaps more importantly given our present context, we also learn from Epiphanius why Seth required a bodily transformation. As long as Seth retained his current material form, he could conceivably fall victim to the same types of temptations that led his father Adam astray. In order to insure Seth's safety, "the higher power ... rendered him spiritual and (only) <apparently> physical,"[51] thus releasing him from the constrictive bonds of human flesh. No longer a corporeal entity, Seth was now immune to the alluring blandishments of the rulers of this world.

A thematically cognate version of this particular motif appears to be present in a literary source reproduced by the anonymous Christian compiler of the eighth-century Syriac *Chronicle of Zuqnin.*[52] This textual fragment, which displays some intriguing indications of a heterodox provenance,[53] is closely related to the material transmitted by Pseudo-Chrysostom (the Latin *Opus Imperfectum in Matthaeum*) on the visit of the Magi to Bethlehem[54] and the so-called "Prophecy of Zardūšt" regarding the eventual birth and career of Jesus.[55] Therein we read:

> These princes (i.e., the Magi) received instructions and laws and even books from their ancestors, each generation receiving them from the one preceding, deriving ultimately from Seth, the son of our forefather Adam. For Adam revealed to Seth, his own son,[56] and declared to him about his (Adam's) original majesty prior to his transgressing the commandment and his expulsion from Paradise, and he warned his son Seth not to transgress against righteousness like he (had done). *Seth received the instruction of his father with a pure heart, and he was protected by the integrity and favor of the Exalted Lord of Greatness.* It was granted to Seth that he might inscribe a book and promulgate wisdom and invoke the name of the Lord (cf. Gen 4:26?), the Lord of every soul that seeks the Living One. It was due to him (Seth) that a book first appeared in the world, one which he inscribed in the name of the Exalted One. And Seth entrusted the book which he wrote to his descendants, and it was handed down in succession to Noah, one who also happened to be righteous, the one who escaped the waters.[57]

The curious allusion to the preservation of Seth's "purity" via the direct intervention of the "Exalted Lord of Greatness," a title moreover that is intriguingly reminiscent of those granted the supreme deity in Mandaeism ("Lord of Greatness") and Manichaeism ("Father of Greatness"),[58] suggests that this narrative presents a lightly sanitized version of what were originally sectarian traditions expounding the authoritative transmission of gnosis from Seth to his worthy descendants. The latter groups emphasized Seth's exalted status as a heavenly entity in his own right ("another seed," Allogenes), or alternatively, his ascent to heaven and personal instruction there, as surety for the information which he revealed to subsequent generations. More orthodox interpreters grounded Seth's authority in that of his biological father in order to distance Seth from these suspicious supernal associations.[59]

There is consequently no need to situate the transformation of Seth, or for that matter the similar alteration in status predicated of Adam, among the superficially analogous traditions involving bodily metamorphosis that occur in both biblical and extrabiblical literature.[60] To judge from the extant evidence, this motif is primarily prophylactic in function, although the idea of a bodily transformation as "reward" for exemplary service; i.e., a species of apotheosis, is occasionally visible in the sources. A temporary transformation in status serves to protect human visitors touring the heavenly realms from bodily harm, and insures that the celestial region will not be contaminated by the plethora of impurities produced and borne by corporeal beings.[61] Seth's experience, however, varies significantly from these patterns. The integrity of heaven is not under assault. Nor does Seth risk attack while temporarily sequestered in the celestial heights. Rather, Seth courts archonic

malice as long as he retains his corporeal form *upon earth.* Ironically, he must undergo a transformation and assume quasi-angelic status in order to return and live unmolested among material beings.

ἐκεῖνος ὁ ἄγγελος τὴν χεῖρα αὐτοῦ ἐπὶ τὴν δεξιάν μου θεὶς καὶ ἐξέωσέ με ἀπὸ τοῦ κόσμου ἐξ οὗ ἐγεννήθην καὶ ἀπήνεγκεν εἰς ἕτερον τόπον πάνυ μέγιστον "That angel placed his hand upon my right (hand) and took me out of the world wherein I was born and brought me to another place (that was) exceedingly great." The actual notice of Seth's ascent occurs after his experience of corporeal transformation, a succession of events which is the reverse of the pattern typically exhibited in ascent apocalypses.[62] Assuming (for the moment) the text's essential integrity, it would appear that Seth underwent his metamorphosis while still resident upon earth. Interestingly, an identical narrative sequence would seem to be present in the Coptic Gnostic tractate *Allogenes* (NHC XI.3): a heavenly emissary appears before the seer (whose cognomen significantly is "Allogenes"; i.e., a popular by-name of Seth), the seer is transformed, and he then ascends to heaven.[63]

As we have seen, the Archontic sect promulgated a distinctive set of traditions regarding the occultation of Seth which includes an ascent-experience. In addition to that material, there are several other isolated notices featuring his ascension. The aforementioned *Allogenes* tractate is certainly cognizant of this motif, although it is admittedly unclear whether the title character represents Seth or one of his spiritual descendants. The Byzantine chronographer George Syncellus, a valuable tradent of numerous "lost" pseudepigraphic fragments,[64] records that "in the year 270 of (the life of) Adam,[65] Seth, having been taken up by angels, received instruction regarding the transgression which the Watchers were going to commit and the future Flood of water and the coming of the Savior."[66] According to this tradition, Seth spent forty days among the angels before returning to earth and teaching his contemporaries the mysteries imparted to him in heaven.[67] The affinity between this notice and the *CMC* fragment is obvious, although nothing is said in the former passage about a bodily transfiguration of the forefather.[68] The source from which Syncellus cites this tradition seems to be related to both Enochic literature (the fall of the Watchers)[69] and to those *Adamschriften* that ascribe a proleptic knowledge of the Flood and the birth of Christ to Adam.[70] The latter cycle of writings characteristically reduce the role of Seth to that of a recording scribe: he simply transcribes Adam's prophecies and archives them for a future age. Interestingly, the Syncellus passage maintains Seth's status as a revelatory authority, generically aligning it with texts emanating from a sectarian provenance.

Finally, Mandaean literature contains a curious passage that relates an ascension of "Šitil, son of Adam." Therein the "Life," supreme among those entities who inhabit the Mandaean Realm of Light, decides that the time for Adam's death has arrived. Accordingly he dispatches Ṣaurēl, the angel of death,[71] to summon Adam's soul back to heaven. But in a comic sequence reminiscent of the dialogues found in *T. Abr.* 16-20 and *Deut. Rab.* 11, Adam refuses to die,[72] offering instead his son Šitil as a substitute. Šitil also is

reluctant to leave his body, but eventually his respect for the will of the deity prompts him to overcome his fears. Casting off his "torso of flesh," he dons a "garment of radiance" and "turban of light," whereupon "winds, winds took up Šitil, son of Adam; storms, storms carried him away, lifted him up and placed him in a great cloud of light."[73] Šitil entreats the heavenly entities to grant Adam a glimpse of the marvelous world which he rejected by his initial refusal to die, and Adam accordingly enjoys such a vision. Regretting his recalcitrance, Adam now summons his son to return to earth so that he (Adam) can take Šitil's place in the heavenly realms. But Šitil rebukes Adam for his refusal to heed the initial command, and instead of returning proceeds onward:

> Winds, winds took away Shitil, the son of Adam, storms, storms led him away, made him ascend and placed him near the watch-house of Shilmai,[74] the man, the treasurer, who is holding the pins of splendour by his hand and the keys of Kushṭā on (his) two arms. They opened for him the gate of the treasure house, lifted up for him the great curtain of Truth, brought him in and showed him that vine whose inner part is splendour, whose sides are light, whose heels are water, and whose branches Uthras, whose leaves are the lanterns of light, and whose seed is the great root of souls.[75]

The use of "winds" and "storms" as the agencies of ascent is formulaic in Mandaean literature: identical language is used, for example, of the successive ascents of Dīnānūkht the scribe.[76] However, this mode of aerial travel is reminiscent of the ascension of Enoch recounted in *1 Enoch* 14:8-9: "... and in my vision the winds spread ('their wings' under?) me and bore me up and carried me into heaven."[77] Note that the physical transformation of Seth prior to his ascent correlates with the sequence of events indicated by the *CMC* fragment. Moreover, the cosmic "vine" (גופנא) which he beholds during this experience is consonant with the revelation of "awesome secrets" (μέγιστα μυστήρια) mentioned later in our fragment.[78]

The language employed in the "apocalypse" suggestively echoes that found within these analogues. Seth's removal is effected by the angel's grasping of his "right hand" in order to lift him physically from the surface of the earth. This particular mode of transport from earth to heaven is perhaps exegetically dependent upon Ps 73:23-24, a passage whose implications for the mechanisms of human ascent were noticed by at least one traditional commentary:[79] ואני תמיד עמך אחזת ביד ימיני בעצתך תנחני ואחר כבוד תקחני "for I am always with You; you grasped my right hand (and) led me into your counsel,[80] and afterwards granted me glory." The same means of conveyance emerges in *1 Enoch* 71:3: "And the angel Michael, one of the archangels, took hold of me by my right hand, and raised me, and led me out"[81] from the material realm to heaven. One might note that the use of the "hand" without further qualification also figures in the ascent mechanism of *Asc. Isa.* 7:3-9: "And I was looking at him (the angel) when he took me by the hand ... and we went up, he and I, into the vault of heaven ...."[82]

Aside from the obvious physical leverage wielded by such an action, it seems likely that the Manichaean emphasis upon the symbolic salvific character of the "right hand" has governed the construction of this scene.

According to *Kephalaia* 39.19-24, prior to the fabrication of the material universe, Primal Man was delivered from his captivity among the hosts of Darkness by the supernal entity known as the Living Spirit, who "extended to him the 'second right hand' (and) removed him from the conflict."[83] The ideology behind the Mandaean ritual termed *kušṭā*, or the exchange of a hand-clasp with the right hand between priest and layperson, is also relevant here.[84] This ceremonial gesture is aetiologically based upon a similar grip featured in a mythological account of the redemption of Adam, and comes to serve as a symbol for communion with the Realm of Light.[85] The grasping of the "right hand" by the heavenly being is thus not simply a functional gesture; rather, it physically expresses a perceived unity of being between the deity and the privileged human. Note, for example, the following text from the Mandaean *Left Ginzā*: "They seized Adam *by his right hand* and took (him) up *and established him in his heavenly abode*, the place where the Great (Life) dwelt."[86] A related instance occurs later in the same work within a hymn:

> The Life knew about me,
> Adam, who slept, awoke.
> He took me by the palm of my right hand
> And gave a ... (?) into my hand.
> He threw light into the darkness,
> And the darkness was filled with light.
> On the day when light arises,
> Darkness will return to its place.[87]

As Rudolph has perceptively noted, the *kušṭā* motif signals a recognition of the embodied soul as a displaced being of Light, and presages its eventual installation within its true home. When viewed from this perspective, the clasping of Seth's right hand and his sudden removal from the material plane assume a more profound significance in the present context.[88]

The description of the heavenly realm as a "place (that was) exceedingly great" parallels the one found in 1QH 3:19-22 quoted above, where the supernal height is depicted as מישור לאין חקר "a plain of limitless expanse." Compare also *CMC* 53.11-12, where Enosh beholds, among other sights, "a flat plain" (συχνὰς πεδιάδας).

ἤκουον δὲ ἐκ τῶν ὄπισθέν μου θορύβου μεγίστου ἐκ τῶν ἀγγέλων ἐκείνων ὧν κα[τέ]λειψ[α ἐν] τῷ κόσμ[ῳ αὐτῶν ὑπαρ]χόντων [καὶ .... ν]των. ἰδ[ὼν δὲ .... ἀν]θρω[π------ at least two lines missing] "Behind me I heard a loud uproar from those angels whom [I l]eft behind [in] the world which the[y poss]essed ... (at least 2 lines missing) ..." As noted above, the tone of this passage suggests a dualistically constructed setting. The angels who "possess the world" are presumably demiurgic archons; they control the world because they are its creators.[89] Their "loud uproar" signals their rage over the successful escape of the righteous Seth from their corruptive clutches. This passage appears to form part of the same trajectory evidenced by Epiphanius in his recountal of the traditions about the life of Seth which were preserved among the Archontic

sect (*Panarion* 40.7.1-3). Moreover, this same "escape-motif" may be echoed in *Zost.* (NHC VIII.1) 4.20-31:

> When he (the angel of the knowledge of eternal life) had said this [to me], I very quickly and very gladly went up with him to a great light-cloud. I cast my body upon the earth to be guarded by glories. *I was rescued from the whole world* and the thirteen aeons in it *and their angelic beings*. They did not see us, but *their archon was disturbed at [our] passage* ....[90]

While the angels remain unaware of the seer's removal, their ruler experiences some discomfort, the precise nature of which (verbal?) remains unclear due to the fragmentary state of the text at this juncture. Given the strong likelihood that the title character "Zostrianos" (i.e., Zoroaster) is simply Seth in oriental guise,[91] it appears possible that an identical complex of traditions lies behind the Archontic, 'Audian, Manichaean, and Nag Hammadi textual witnesses.

π[ολλὰ δὲ τούτοις παρα]πλήσια ἐλέχθη ἐν ταῖς γραφαῖς αὐτοῦ καὶ ὡς ἡρπάγη ὑπ' ἐκείνου τοῦ ἀγγέλου ἀπὸ κόσμου εἰς κόσμον καὶ ἀπεκάλυψεν αὐτῷ μέγιστα μυστήρια τῆς μεγαλωσύνης "M[any things simi]lar to these are described in his writings, and as he was transported by that angel from world to world, he revealed to him the awesome secrets of (divine) majesty." The shift in pronominal referent indicates that the formal first-person "citation" of the "apocalypse" ended within the lacuna preceding the present passage. The remainder of the fragment stems undoubtedly from the redactor of this section of the *Codex*, presumably Baraies.

The phrase "in his writings" (ἐν ταῖς γραφαῖς αὐτοῦ) indicates that multiple "books of Seth" containing valuable revelatory material were potentially available for the purpose of authenticating the present "apocalypse of Sethel." This is not a surprising claim. As we have repeatedly seen, there are numerous testimonia to the popularity of allegedly Sethian compositions during late antiquity. Moreover, to judge from their proliferate composition, transmission, and translation of a wide variety of *Adamschriften*, Syro-Mesopotamian religious communities took a special interest in the literary vocation of this particular forefather.

The reasons for this fascination are not difficult to discern. Seth, like Adam his father, bore "the image of God" (Gen 5:1-3); his ill-fated brethren lacked this essential imprimatur. The Syriac *Cave of Treasures*, that rich depository of oriental exegetical lore, relates: "Then Adam had sexual intercourse again with Eve, and she became pregnant, and gave birth to Seth, *a handsome (child), mighty and perfect like Adam.* He was the ancestor of all the mighty ones before the Flood."[92] In other words, Seth was a type of *Adam redivivus*, a regenerated Adam who reprises the virtues of his prototype save for his regrettable lapse in the garden. Such a status enjoys inherent privileges, not the least among which are a demonstrably close relationship with the deity as well as a position of leadership among the early generations of humanity.[93] Moreover, given the circumstances of his birth and status, Seth becomes an obvious candidate for the reliable transmission of the repentant Adam's exhortations and testimonies, especially when Seth

himself is credited with the invention of writing.[94] It is thus hardly surprising to discover that many of the extant *Adamschriften* explicitly claim a Sethian authorship.

In this latter class of writings, Seth never ascends to heaven and rarely enjoys an exclusive angelophany.[95] Instead, he functions primarily as an amanuensis, recording information related to him by his parents in order to guide future generations. This passive, indeed subordinating, vocation appears to be a deliberate narrative devaluation of the exalted status enjoyed by Seth in sectarian and gnostic traditions, wherein Seth exercises an independent revelatory authority and forms an essential link in the chain of prophetic forebears. The more orthodox circles eventually strip Seth of all those attributes which might suggest a supernatural origin or identity.

Excursus: Seth as Recurrent Salvific Avatar

One intriguing aspect of late antique speculation about the character and significance of the forefather Seth is the notion that he is simply the initial material manifestation of a preexistent heavenly entity who periodically descends to the physical realm and "clothes" itself in human flesh in order to impart authoritative instruction regarding the supernal realm. This concept of the cyclical return of a discrete heavenly entity in diverse human forms is structurally congruous with the Manichaean doctrine of the recurrent incarnation of the Apostle of Light within select antediluvian biblical forefathers and "national" religious teachers like the Buddha, Zoroaster, and Jesus. As discussed in Chapter One above, the Manichaean version of this teaching appears to be a variant formulation of the so-called "true prophet" doctrine of the Pseudo-Clementines and Ebionite Christianity. Given the close concord of the Sethian apostolic scheme with these attested analogues, one should probably link this latter expression of the concept to the same ideological environment.

This notion of the repeated incarnation upon earth of a "heavenly Seth" is arguably one of the constituent features of so-called "Sethian" gnosticism. B.A. Pearson has provided a concise survey of the most important places where this doctrine finds expression, calling attention to its occurrence in patristic testimonies and certain Nag Hammadi works.[96] These instances invariably stress an essential identity between the figures of Seth and Jesus, sometimes by means of genealogy (*Panarion* 39.3.5), but more often via assimilation (*Panarion* 39.1.3; *Gos. Eg.* 64.1-3; 65.16-18). Obviously this specific correlation requires a Christian context for its construction. It is possible, as Pearson argues, that the Christian identification of Seth with Jesus may be presaged in certain Jewish traditions that apparently attach a "messianic" significance to the figure of Seth. For example, Pearson notes that the "Animal Apocalypse" (*1 Enoch* 85-90), a symbolic narrative composed no later than the mid-second century BCE, portrays both Seth and the future eschatological deliverer in the form of a white bull. Moreover, an early midrash (*Gen. Rab.* 23.5) pregnantly connects Gen 4:25, the verse relating the naming of Seth, with the appearance of the "messianic king" at the End of Days.[97]

Mirroring the practice attested by the Pseudo-Clementines, Mani, and Muhammad, some gnostic circles apparently constructed official rosters of Sethian "prophets" or "teachers" who served as fleshly vehicles for the temporal sojourn of the "heavenly Seth." This is presumably the import of the tradition regarding the "seven sons (of Seth) termed 'strangers'" (*Panarion* 40.7.5); it is doubtful whether Seth's biological progeny are intended by this phrase. The enumeration of "seven" sons is suggestive in this context, given its demonstrable popularity as an ordering principle governing the arrangement of several other heterodox lists of authoritative spiritual instructors.[98] Unfortunately Epiphanius does not provide the corporeal identities of these "sons." Anonymity also characterizes the thirteen separate manifestations of the "illuminator" (φωστήρ) recounted in a cryptic hymn contained within the Coptic *Apocalypse of Adam* (NHC V.5),[99] a series which is probably connected with the analogous appearance of an "illuminator" (φωστήρ) among "thirteen aeons" in the Coptic *Gospel of the Egyptians* (NHC III.2). Significantly, this latter text goes on to identify the φωστήρ as "Seth" *and* "the living Jesus" (64.1-9).[100]

The term φωστήρ thus functions in these latter contexts as a *terminus technicus* for an avatar of the "heavenly Seth." Interestingly, the same Greek designation is employed by the Coptic Manichaean texts as a title for the "Apostle of Light,"[101] the supernal entity who periodically descends to earth in human guise in order to proclaim Manichaean gnosis. This can hardly be coincidental. The use of φωστήρ by both the Sethian and the Manichaean communities to signify human incarnations of their respective heavenly alter-egos (heavenly Seth/Apostle of Light) suggests an intellectual nexus, probably literary in nature, between these two groups. Their mutual recognition of both Seth and Jesus as authentic emissaries further cements this posited bond. Even though Sethian texts and testimonia display some reticence in revealing the human identities of that system's salvific agents, one is able to discern an additional common φωστήρ which they share. The *Apocryphon of John* cites a "book of Zoroaster" as an authority for its correlation of bodily passions with archonic angels.[102] The Coptic tractate *Zostrianos* seems to regard the Iranian sage Zoroaster as one of the corporeal manifestations of the heavenly Seth.[103] As we have previously seen, Mani also views Zoroaster as an avatar of the Apostle of Light.

The resultant apostolic chain (Seth-Zoroaster-Jesus) generated by this gnostic assimilation sheds some light upon a curious text preserved within Syriac Christian literature known as the "Prophecy of Zardūšt."[104] Its potential importance for the present topic requires its full translation at this point.

The Prophecy of Zardūšt:

Zardūšt is actually Baruch the scribe. When he was sitting by the spring of waters named Gloša of Hōrin, the place where the royal bath stood, he spoke to his disciples Gūšnasaph the king, Sasan, and Mahimad, (saying) 'Listen my

children and beloved ones, for I shall reveal to you a mystery concerning the great king who is going to rise in the world. In the fullness of time and at the end of the final age an infant will be conceived and its members shaped within the womb of a virgin, without a man approaching her. He will be like a tree with lovely foliage and copious fruit that stands in a parched place. The inhabitants of that place will struggle to uproot it from the ground, but they will not succeed. Then they shall seize him and crucify him upon a tree, and heaven and earth will sit in mourning on his account, and the generations of the peoples will mourn for him. He will begin (by) descending to the abysses below, and from the abyss he will be exalted to the height. Then he will come with armies of light, riding upon bright clouds, for he is a child conceived by the word which established the natural order.'

Gūšnasaph said to him: 'This one of whom you speak these things, from where does his power come? Is he greater than you, or are you greater than he?'

Zardūšt replied to him: 'He is a descendant of my lineage. I am he, and he is me; he is in me, and I in him. When the advent of his coming is made manifest, great signs will appear in heaven, and his light will prevail over the light of the sun. You, sons of the seed of life, who come from the treasuries of life and light and spirit, and have been sown in a place of fire and water, it is necessary for you to watch and guard these things which I have told you so that you can look for his appointed time. For you will be the first to perceive the arrival of that great king, the one whom the prisoners await so that they can be released. And now, my sons, preserve this mystery which I have revealed to you, and may it be preserved in the treasuries of your souls. When that star which I told you about rises, you shall dispatch messengers bearing gifts, and they shall offer worship to him. Observe, take care, and do not despise him, so that he not destroy you with the sword. He is the king of kings, and all kings receive their crowns from him. I and he are one.'

These (things) were uttered by that second Balaam. As is customary, (either) God forced him to expound them; or he derived from a people who were conversant with the prophecies about Our Lord Jesus Christ, and he (simply) declared them.[105]

Although now preserved only in orthodox sources, the "Prophecy of Zardūšt" displays certain features which indicate that its conceptual core may be rooted in Syro-Mesopotamian gnostic circles. The use of the phrase "great king" (ܡܠܟܐ ܪܒܐ) in reference to an eschatological deliverer suggestively parallels the terminology employed in Manichaean apocalyptic speculation.[106] Portraying the authoritative teacher with arboreal imagery is a favorite trope of Manichaean parabolic discourse.[107] The redeemer's triumphant return "riding upon bright clouds" (ܒܥܢܢܐ ܥܠ ܥܢܢܐ ܕܢܗܝܪܐ) evokes the image of a Mandaean *'uthra* ensconced in a "cloud of light."[108] Phrases like "sons of the seed of life"[109] and "treasuries of life[110] and light"[111] pepper the lexicon of Syro-Mesopotamian gnosis. But perhaps the clearest indication of this text's sectarian provenance emerges in Zardūšt's response to his disciple's question about the source of the future king's "power" (ܫܘܠܛܢܗ):[112] "He is a descendant of my lineage. I am he and he is me; he is in me, and I in him."[113] Similarly, at the conclusion of the oracle, Zardūšt reiterates "I and he are one."[114] The author of these exclamations thus affirms the essential identity of Zoroaster and Jesus, an assimilation which is consonant with both Sethian and Manichaean apostolic ideology.

Previous studies of this oracle have largely viewed it as an opportunistic combination of Zoroastrian and Christian eschatological teachings. According to this widely accepted interpretation, Zardūšt's declaration of his biological connection with Christ represents a conscious adaptation of the Zoroastrian doctrine of the advent of the Saošyant, or World Savior, who was "to be born of the prophet's seed from a virgin mother."[115] Be that as it may, the conceptual and linguistic affinities which we have isolated above link this text firmly with the thought-world of Syro-Mesopotamian gnosis. The "Prophecy of Zardūšt" is apparently a valuable survival, with only minimal adaptation, of an original gnostic source.

NOTES

[1]*CMC* 50.8-52.7. Text cited from L. Koenen and C. Römer, *Der Kölner Mani-Kodex ... Kritische Edition* (Opladen: Westdeutscher Verlag, 1988) 32-34.

[2]*Psalm-Book* 142.4; *Kephalaia* 12.10-11, 42.29, 145.26-27. Compare *Left Ginzā* 426.31-32; 427.2, 4, 12-13, 19, 20-21, 24, 32, 35, 38; 428.3, 5, 12-13; 429.3, 17, 22-23 (ed. Lidzbarski), which repeatedly speak of "Šitil, son of Adam."

[3]See line 25 of the Chester Beatty Library fragment of Berlin P. 15997, cited by M. Tardieu, "L'arrivée des manichéens à al-Ḥīra," *La Syrie de Byzance à l'Islam, VII^e-VIII^e siècles* (ed. P. Canivet and J.-P. Rey-Coquais; Damas: Institut français de Damas, 1992) 16-17. Tardieu plausibly suggests (p. 18 n.11) that the same "Sethel" was the recipient of an epistle from Mani. See Ibn al-Nadīm, *Fihrist* (*apud* G. Flügel, *Mani: seine Lehre und seine Schriften* [Leipzig, 1862; reprinted, Osnabrück: Biblio Verlag, 1969] 74.13): رسالة شاتل وسكنى "epistle (to) Sethel and Saknay."

[4]So Tardieu, "L'arrivée" 18 n.11; B. Visotzky, "Rabbinic Randglossen to the Cologne Mani Codex," *ZPE* 52 (1983) 298; K. Rudolph, *Theogonie, Kosmogonie und Anthropogonie in den mandäischen Schriften* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1965) 304 n.4.

[5]Regarding the angelic suffix *-i'ēl*, see especially S.M. Olyan, *A Thousand Thousands Served Him: Exegesis and the Naming of Angels in Ancient Judaism* (Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr, 1993) 72 n.6.

[6]*Ginzā* 602 (ed. Lidzbarski) *s.v.* Šitil. See also Theodore bar Konai, *Liber Scholiorum* (CSCO scrip. syri, ser. II, t. 66; ed. A. Scher; Paris: Carolus Poussielgue, 1912) 345.4-5, where among a roster of Mandaean divine entities appears the name ܫܬܝܠ; i.e., "Sethel." Note the important remarks of T. Nöldeke, Review of H. Pognon, *Inscriptions mandaites des coupes de Khouabir*, in *WZKM* 12 (1898) 356-57.

[7]In addition to the sources cited above in n.2, note Ibn al-Nadīm, *Fihrist* (*apud* Flügel, *Mani* 61.5, 8, 10); M 1859, which preserves the name *šytyl* ("Sethel") in a narrative context closely related to the one recounted in the *Fihrist* (*apud* W. Sundermann, *Mittelpersische und parthische kosmogonische und Parabeltexte der Manichäer* [Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1973] 77); M 22, which mentions *šytyl* when listing the links in the prophetic chain of witnesses (W.B. Henning, "Ein manichäisches Henochbuch," *SPAW* [1934] 28 n.7); and M 101, where the name *šyt[yl]* has been plausibly restored in a similar roster (W.B. Henning, "The Book of the Giants," *BSOAS* 11 [1943-46] 58, 63). The curious broken reference to being "crowned like Sethel" in *Homilies* 61.23 may also refer to this same tradition. According to Ibn al-Nadīm, after Adam had successfully defended the newborn Sethel from the attacks of al-Ṣindīd, one of the deities of the Realm of Light "hurried (to Adam bearing) a crown of radiance, extending it in his hand to Adam. When al-Ṣindīd and the archons saw this, they departed (and went) away" (*apud* Flügel, *Mani* 61.1-3). While one might assume that the crown is for Adam (*à la Cave of Treasures*), the text does not explicitly state this, and so it remains possible that the crown was actually destined for Sethel.

[8]G.G. Stroumsa, *Another Seed: Studies in Gnostic Mythology* (NHS 24; Leiden: Brill, 1984) 73-77.

[9]E.g., *Right Ginzā* 118.18 (ed. Lidzbarski): *šitil šitla ṭaba* "Šitil, the excellent plant(ation)." Text cited from the transcription of Rudolph, *Theogonie* 294. See also A.J.H.W. Brandt, *Die mandäische Religion* (Leipzig, 1889; reprinted, Amsterdam: Philo Press, 1973) 124.

[10]Ibn al-Nadīm, *Fihrist* (*apud* Flügel, *Mani* 61.3-5): ثم ظهرت لادم شجرة يقال لها لوطيس فظهر منها لبن فكان يغذّى الصبى به وسمّاه باسمها ثم سمّاه بعد ذلك شاثل .

[11]Stroumsa, *Another Seed* 74.

[12]Arabic لوطيس, presumably from Syriac ܠܘܛܝܣ, itself loaned from Greek λωτός. Was this designation ever more than an imaginative solution to the origin of the name "Sethel"? The initial orthography of the word matches that of the biblical name "Lot"; i.e., the nephew of Abraham who is associated with the destruction of Sodom and Gomorrah and who becomes the ancestor of the Moabites and the Ammonites. At first glance, there would seem to be absolutely no connection between the figures of Seth and Lot, but note *Gos. Eg.* 60.9-18: "Then the great Seth came and brought his seed. And it was sown in the aeons which had been brought forth, their number being the amount of Sodom. Some say that Sodom is the place of pasture of the great Seth, which is Gomorrah. But others (say) that the great Seth took his plant out of Gomorrah and planted it in the second place to which he gave the name Sodom." Translation is taken from *The Nag Hammadi Library in English* (3d ed.; ed. J.M. Robinson; San Francisco: Harper & Row, 1988) 215.

[13]The Qur'ān speaks of the murder and burial of Abel (5:27-31), but the brothers are not mentioned by name. See al-Ṭabarī, *Ta'rīkh ar-rasul wa-l-mulūk* (cf. *Annales quos scripsit Abu Djafar Mohammed ibn Djarir at-Tabari* [15 vols.; ed. M.J. De Goeje; reprinted, Leiden: Brill, 1964-65] 1.137-52); al-Ya'qūbī, *Ta'rikh* (cf. *Ibn Wadih qui dicitur al-Ja'qubi historiae* ... [2 vols.; ed. M.T. Houtsma; Leiden: Brill, 1883] 1.3-4; al-Kisā'ī, *Qiṣaṣ al-anbiyā'* (2 vols.; ed. I. Eisenberg; Leiden: Brill, 1922-23) 1.72-75. For a general discussion, see G. Vajda, "Hābīl wa Ḳābīl," *EI²* 3.13-14.

[14]So Nöldeke, *WZKM* 12 (1898) 356 n.4.

[15]C.C. Torrey opines that the names Qābīl and Hābīl are pre-Islamic, but offers no evidence to support his statement. See his *The Jewish Foundation of Islam* (New York: Jewish Institute of Religion Press, 1933) 50.

[16]Note Epiphanius, *Panarion* 39.2.3-7.

[17]Epiphanius, *Panarion* 40.2.2, 5.3, 7.1-5: ἤδη δὲ καὶ τοῖς Ἀλλογενέσι καλουμένοις κέχρηνται· βίβλοι γάρ εἰσιν οὕτω καλούμεναι ... ἕτερον δὲ πάλιν μῦθον λέγουσιν οἱ τοιοῦτοι, ὅτι, φησίν, ὁ διάβολος ἐλθὼν πρὸς τὴν Εὔαν συνήφθη αὐτῇ ὡς ἀνὴρ γυναικὶ καὶ ἐγέννησεν ἐξ αὐτῆς τὸν τε Κάϊν καὶ τὸν Ἄβελ ... πάλιν δὲ λέγουσιν οἱ αὐτοὶ τὸν Ἀδὰμ συναφθέντα τῇ Εὔᾳ τῇ ἰδίᾳ γαμετῇ γεγεννηκέναι τὸν Σήθ, φύσει ἴδιον αὐτοῦ υἱόν. καὶ τότε φασὶ τὴν ἄνω δύναμιν σὺν τοῖς ὑπουργοῖς τοῦ ἀγαθοῦ θεοῦ ἀγγέλοις καταβεβηκέναι καὶ ἡρπακέναι αὐτὸν τὸν Σήθ, ὃν καὶ Ἀλλογενῆ καλοῦσι, καὶ ἀνενηνοχέναι ἄνω που καὶ ἀναθρέψαι χρόνῳ ἱκανῷ, ἵνα μὴ ἀποκτανθῇ, καὶ μετὰ χρόνον πολὺν πάλιν κατενηνοχέναι εἰς τόνδε τὸν κόσμον καὶ πνευματικὸν ἀπεργάσασθαι αὐτὸν καὶ σωματικὸν <φαινόμενον>, εἰς τὸ μὴ κατισχύειν τόν τε <δημιουργὸν> κατ' αὐτοῦ καὶ τὰς ἄλλας ἐξουσίας καὶ ἀρχὰς τοῦ κοσμοποιοῦ θεοῦ. μηκέτι δὲ αὐτόν φασι λελατρευκέναι τῷ τε ποιητῇ καὶ δημιουργῷ, ἐπεγνωκέναι δὲ τὴν ἀκατονόμαστον δύναμιν καὶ τὸν ἄνω ἀγαθὸν θεόν, τούτῳ <τε> λελατρευκέναι καὶ κατὰ τοῦ ποιητοῦ τοῦ κόσμου καὶ ἀρχῶν καὶ ἐξουσιῶν πολλὰ

ἀποκεκαλυφέναι. ὅθεν δὴ καὶ βίβλους τινὰς ἐξετύπωσαν εἰς ὄνομα αὐτοῦ τοῦ Σὴθ γεγραμμένας, παρ' αὐτοῦ αὐτὰς δεδόσθαι λέγοντες, ἄλλας δὲ εἰς ὄνομα αὐτοῦ καὶ τῶν ἑπτὰ υἱῶν αὐτοῦ. φασὶ γὰρ αὐτὸν ἑπτὰ γεγεννηκέναι <υἱοὺς> Ἀλλογενεῖς καλουμένους, ὡς καὶ ἐν ἄλλαις αἱρέσεσιν εἰρήκαμεν, Γνωστικῶν φημι καὶ Σηθιανῶν. Text cited from *Epiphanius (Ancoratus und Panarion), Zweiter Band: Panarion Haer. 34-64* (GCS 31; ed. K. Holl; Leipzig: J.C. Hinrichs, 1922) 82-88; translation is adapted from that of B. Layton, *The Gnostic Scriptures* (Garden City, NY: Doubleday & Co., 1987) 196-98. Epiphanius' cross-references are to *Panarion* 26.8.1 (ἄλλοι δὲ εἰς τὸν προειρημένον Ἰαλδαβαὼθ εἰς ὄνομα τε τοῦ Σὴθ πολλὰ βιβλία ὑποτίθενται) and 39.5.1 (ἐξ ὀνόματος μὲν Σὴθ ἑπτὰ λέγουσιν εἶναι βίβλους, ἄλλας δὲ βίβλους ἑτέρας Ἀλλογενεῖς οὕτω καλοῦσιν).

[18]See, for example, M. Tardieu, "Les livres mis sous le nom de Seth et les Séthiens de l'hérésiologie," *Gnosis and Gnosticism: Papers Read at the Seventh International Conference on Patristic Studies (Oxford, September 8th-13th 1975)* (NHS 8; ed. M. Krause; Leiden: Brill, 1977) 206 n.11: "La remarque d'Épiphane en XL, 7, 5 montre bien que Séthiens, Archontiques et Gnostiques ne constituent pas trois groupes distincts, mais une seule et même idéologie ...."

[19]*Panarion* 40.1.1: οὐκ ἐν πολλοῖς δὲ τόποις αὕτη φέρεται ἢ μόνον ἐν τῇ Παλαιστινῶν ἐπαρχίᾳ· μετήνεγκαν δὲ τὸν αὐτῶν ἰὸν ἤδη που καὶ εἰς τὴν μεγάλην Ἀρμενίαν. Translation from Layton, *Gnostic Scriptures* 194.

[20]H.-C. Puech, "Fragments retrouvés de l'«Apocalypse d'Allogène»," *Annuaire de l'institut de philologie et d'histoire orientales et slaves (Bruxelles)* 4 (1936) 935-62, reprinted in idem, *En quête de la gnose* (2 vols.; Paris: Gallimard, 1978) 1.271-300. Subsequent references to this essay will cite the latter edition.

[21]Theodore bar Konai, *Liber Scholiorum* (ed. Scher) 319-20; see also H. Pognon, *Inscriptions mandaïtes des coupes de Khouabir* (Paris, 1898; reprinted, Amsterdam: Philo Press, 1979) 132-33.

[22]The information recounted by Theodore so far is largely dependent upon the testimony of Epiphanius, *Panarion* 70. From this point on, Theodore begins to provide us with "raw" data apparently gleaned from either surviving conventicles of 'Audians or accessible collections of their writings.

[23]According to Epiphanius (*Panarion* 39.5.1), the Sethians used an apocalypse ascribed to Abraham.

[24]Pognon suggests reading ܐܒܪܗܡ in place of ܐܒܪܗ (p. 195 n.1). This emendation is accepted by Puech ("Fragments" 273 n.2) and is accordingly adopted here.

[25]Almost certainly the *Apocryphon of John*, presently attested by four Coptic manuscripts (NHC II.1, III.1, IV.1, and Papyrus Berolinensis 8502.2) and an abbreviated summary in Irenaeus, *Adv. haer.* 1.29-30. See Puech, "Fragments" 295-98.

[26]Reading ܐܠܗܐ in place of ܐܠܗܐ in accordance with Puech, "Fragments" 273 n.4.

[27]J.-B. Chabot suggested reading ܐܝܬܝ in place of ܐܝܬܘ, based upon a parallel to this passage found in the *Chronicle* of Michael the Syrian. See Scher 320 n.1; Puech, "Fragments" 274 n.1.

[28]Compare *Ap. John* 15.13-23: "And the powers began: the first one, goodness, created a bone-soul; and the second, foreknowledge, created a sinew-soul; the third, divinity, created a flesh-soul; and the fourth, the lordship, created a marrow-soul; the fifth, kingdom, created a blood-soul; the sixth, envy, created a skin-soul; the seventh, understanding, created a hair-soul." Translation taken from *Nag Hammadi Library*[3] (ed. Robinson) 113.

[29]Compare *Hyp. Arch.* 89.21-23; *Orig. World* 116.15-20.

[30]An alliterative phrase in Syriac: ܚܝܠܐ ܚܝܪ . For a different wordplay, compare Ephrem, *Hymns Against Heresies* 24.16 lines 5-6 (*Des heiligen Ephraem des Syrers Hymnen contra Haereses* [CSCO 169, scrip. syri 76; ed. E. Beck; Louvain: L. Durbecq, 1957] 95).

[31]Theodore bar Konai, *Liber Scholiorum* (ed. Scher) 320.21-23: ܗܘ ܠܟ ܕܐܝܬ ܒܗ ... ܘܐܝܟ ܕܐܝܬ ܒܗ ... .

[32]The modern editors suggest the following reconstruction for 50.17-18: οὐ γὰρ ἄ]λλο τι ὑ[πῆρξεν ἀλλ' ἢ ἀστ]ραπαὶ "for he was nothing but lightning-flashes." See L. Koenen and A. Henrichs, *ZPE* 19 (1975) 51; Koenen-Römer, *Kritische Edition* 32. Compare the analogous imagery of Luke 17:24. Perhaps the closest verbal parallel to the entire phrase is supplied by *Asc. Isa.* 7:2: "... I saw a glorious angel, whose glory was not like that of the angels I had been in the habit of seeing; for he had a glory and a dignity of a kind so great that I cannot describe the splendour of this angel." Translation is that of R.H. Charles and J.M.T. Barton, "The Ascension of Isaiah," *AOT* (Sparks) 796.

[33]Compare Rev 4:5, which is surely derivative: καὶ ἐκ τοῦ θρόνου ἐκπορεύονται ἀστραπαὶ ....

[34]*CMC* 3.13-14: ποτὲ μὲν γὰρ ἀστραπῆς δίκην ἐφ[ίκ]ε[το ?]. Text and suggested restoration cited from Koenen-Römer, *Kritische Edition* 2.

[35]Perhaps Baraq'el (ברקאל ; Βαρακίηλ)? This name is appropriate for the one whose appearance is like that of lightning. See *1 Enoch* 6:7, 8:3; also the Qumran *Book of Giants* QG6 line 4; QG11 line 2. For the latter references, see J.C. Reeves, *Jewish Lore in Manichaean Cosmogony: Studies in the Book of Giants Traditions* (Cincinnati: Hebrew Union College Press, 1992) 64-65.

[36]Dan 7:2, 7, 13.

[37]Zech 2:1, 5; 5:1, 9; 6:1; Dan 8:3; 10:5; cf. Ezek 8:5.

[38]Theodore bar Konai, *Liber Scholiorum* (ed. Scher) 317.15-17. Compare *Apoc. Adam* 65.26-66.8.

[39]נתן בה דעת להכיר מקום מים שהיה שם כי לא היתה סומא קודם לכן . Compare *Gen. Rab.* 53.14 (Theodor-Albeck 2.573); *Jub.* 17:12.

[40]Koenen-Römer, *Kritische Edition* 32.

[41]See, for example, *T. Abr.* A 11:4-5, 9-10: ἔξωθεν δὲ τῶν πυλῶν τῶν ἐκεῖσε τῶν δύο, ἴδον ἄνδρα καθήμενον ἐπὶ θρόνου κεχρυσωμένου· καὶ ἦν ἡ ἰδέα τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ἐκείνου φοβερὰ, ὁμοία τοῦ δεσπότου· ... ἠρώτησεν δὲ ὁ Ἀβραὰμ τὸν ἀρχιστράτηγον· Κύριέ μου ἀρχιστράτηγε, τίς ἐστιν οὗτος ὁ ἀνὴρ ὁ πανθαύμαστος, ὁ ἐν τοιαύτῃ δόξῃ κοσμούμενος ... εἶπεν δὲ ὁ ἀσώματος· Οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ πρωτόπλαστος Ἀδὰμ, ὁ ἐν τοιαύτῃ δόξῃ ... "And outside the two gates there (i.e., heaven), they (Abraham and Michael) saw a man seated on a golden throne. And the man's appearance was terrifying, like that of the Lord himself ... And Abraham asked the Prince, 'My lord Prince, who is this most wondrous man, who is decked out with so great a glory?' ... The immaterial one made answer, 'This is Adam the protoplast who is in so great a glory.'" Compare *T. Abr.* B 8:5-16. Text of *T. Abr.* taken from M.R. James, *The Testament of Abraham* (TextsS 2.2; Cambridge: University Press, 1892) 88-89; the translation is adapted from that of N. Turner, "The Testament of Abraham," *AOT* (Sparks) 408-409. Note also *1 Enoch* 70:3-4; *Asc. Isa.* 9:7-9.

[42]See Ibn Ezra *ad* Gen 5:1; Ramban *ad* Gen 5:3; *Gen. Rab.* 23.6, 24.6; *Apoc. Mos.* 10:3; *Adam and Eve* 37:3.

[43]Insofar as Seth is "the progenitor of Enosh," i.e., the fountainhead of "humankind," since this is the literal significance of the proper name "Enosh." The figure of Seth thus bridges the gulf between God and humanity, and the Sethite line, or "descendants of Seth," therefore retain their progenitor's "formal" association with God himself. Hence the common Oriental understanding of the infamous "sons of God" episode of Gen 6:1-4 as referring not to "angels," but instead to the progeny of Seth.

[44]See the discussion of the 'Audian *Apocalypse of the Strangers* above, as well as *Tg. Ps.-J.* Gen 4:1; 5:3. *Pirqe R. El.* 21 (ed. Luria 48a) flatly states that neither Cain nor Abel were biological sons of Adam. Note also ibid. 22 (ed. Luria 50a): ויחי אדם שלשים ומאת שנה ויולד בדמותו כצלמו ויקרא את שמו שת (בראשית ה:ג) מכאן אתה למד שלא היה קין מורעו ולא מדמותו ולא מצלמו של אדם ... "'And Adam lived one hundred and thirty years, and then engendered (a son) in his image, according to his likeness, and named him Seth' (Gen 5:3). From this (verse) you learn *that Cain was not of the seed*, image, or likeness of Adam ...."

[45]See *Ap. John* 24.34-25.1; *Hyp. Arch.* 91.30-33; *Gos. Eg.* 71.10-11; Epiphanius, *Panarion* 40.7.1; Ibn al-Nadīm, *Fihrist* (*apud* Flügel, *Mani* 60.7-13).

[46]See *Hyp. Arch.* 91.30-33: "And Adam [knew] his female counterpart Eve, and she became pregnant, and bore [Seth] to Adam. And she said, 'I have borne [another] man *through god*, in place [of Abel].'" Translation is that of Layton, *Gnostic Scriptures* 72, with emphasis added. Note the remark of B.A. Pearson, "Jewish Sources in Gnostic Literature," *Jewish Writings of the Second Temple Period* (CRINT II.2; ed. M.E. Stone; Philadelphia & Assen: Fortress & Van Gorcum, 1984) 468. See also Epiphanius, *Panarion* 39.2.3-4, where the so-called "Mother (of Life? cf. Gen 3:20) took thought and caused Seth to be born. And she deposited her power within him, establishing in him a posterity of the power from above and the spark that had been sent from above for the first establishment of the posterity and the alliance." Translation taken from Layton, *Gnostic Scriptures* 188. Note also the references supplied by Puech, "Fragments" 282 n.4.

[47]Epiphanius, *Panarion* 40.7.1-2, translation adapted from that of Layton, *Gnostic Scriptures* 197-98. See n.15 above.

[48]See Ibn al-Nadīm, *Fihrist* (*apud* Flügel, *Mani* 60-61), which is translated and discussed in Chapter Three, Appendix above.

[49]See Chapter Three, Appendix above; also J.C. Reeves, "Manichaica Aramaica: Adam, Seth, and Magical Praxis" (forthcoming).

[50]Note M 528 Fragment II; M 5566 + M 4501. These fragments preserve tales regarding successive attempts by first Eve and then the archons to murder Seth involving starvation, physical assault (?), and the poisoning of a spring or well. See Chapter Three, Appendix above.

[51]Employing one of the plausible emendations supplied by Holl for what is an obviously corrupt text. In fact, the term πνευματικός can imply this condition without further verbal qualification; see the discussion of R. Reitzenstein, *Hellenistic Mystery-Religions: Their Basic Ideas and Significance* (3d ed.; Pittsburgh, PA: The Pickwick Press, 1978) 67-89.

[52]A single manuscript, often termed the "Pseudo-Dionysius Chronicle" due to J.S. Assemani's mistaken assumption that the ninth-century Jacobite Patriarch Dionysius of Tel-Maḥrē was the compiler of this text. See S.P. Brock, "Syriac Historical Writing: A

Survey of the Main Sources," *Journal of the Iraqi Academy* 5 (1979-80) 10-13; W. Witakowski, *The Syriac Chronicle of Pseudo-Dionysius of Tel-Maḥrē: A Study in the History of Historiography* (Studia Semitica Upsaliensia 9; Uppsala: [Uppsala University], 1987). A translation of this source was prepared by G. Levi Della Vida and published in U. Monneret de Villard, *Le leggende orientali sui Magi evangelici* (Rome: Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, 1952) 27-49.

[53]As to its possible heterodoxy, see G. Widengren, *Iranisch-semitische Kulturbegegnung in parthischer Zeit* (Köln & Opladen: Westdeutscher Verlag, 1960) 71-83; idem, *Mani and Manichaeism* (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1965) 22, 73. The source is identified in a colophon as ܥܢܝܬܐ ܕܡܓܘܣܐ ܘܡܬܢܗ̈ܝܗܘܢ "narrative about the Magi and their gifts." Text cited from *Incerti auctoris Chronicon Pseudo-Dionysianum vulgo dictum* (CSCO 91, 104, scrip. syri 43, 53; ed. J.-B. Chabot; Paris: Reipublicae, 1927-33) 1.91 lines 2-3. Within this source appears a lengthy extract (pp. 62-65) ܡܢ ܟܬܒ̈ܐ ܕܐܝܬܝܢ ܒܡܥܪܬܐ ܕܓܢܙ̈ܐ ܕܣܬܪ̈ܐ ܕܟܠ ܣܬܪ̈ܐ ܓܠܝ̈ܐ ܕܐܡܪ ܐܕܡ ܩܕܡܝܐ ܐܒܘܢ ܕܟܠ ܙܪܥܐ ܪܒܐ ܥܡ ܫܝܬ ܒܪܗ "from the books which were in the Cave of Treasures of Hidden Mysteries, (containing) the entire discourse which our ancestor Adam, the first of our great lineage, spoke with Seth his son" (ed. Chabot 1.62 lines 1-3). While there are affinities with the *Testament of Adam*, the extract does not correspond with any known Adamic pseudepigraphon.

[54]See J. Bidez and F. Cumont, *Les mages hellénisés* (2 vols.; Paris, 1938; reprinted, New York: Arno Press, 1975) 2.118-120; Witakowski, *Syriac Chronicle* 129.

[55]For versions of the text of the "Prophecy of Zardūšt" (ܢܒܘܬܐ ܕܙܪܕܘܫܬ), see Theodore bar Konai, *Liber Scholiorum* (ed. Scher) 74-75 (text); *The Book of the Bee* (ed. E.A.W. Budge; Oxford: Clarendon, 1886) 89-90 (text). See moreover the important discussions of R.J.H. Gottheil, "References to Zoroaster in Syriac and Arabic Literature," *Classical Studies in Honour of Henry Drisler* (New York: Macmillan and Co., 1894) 24-51; W. Bousset, *Hauptprobleme der Gnosis* (Göttingen, 1907; reprinted, Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1973) 378-82; Bidez-Cumont, *Les mages hellénisés* 2.117-35; Monneret de Villard, *Le leggende orientali* 128-56; A.J. Welburn, "Iranian Prophetology and the Birth of the Messiah: The Apocalypse of Adam," *ANRW* II.25.6 (Berlin: W. de Gruyter, 1988) 4752-94, esp. 4785-86.

[56]Is this a reflection of the traditions alleging a demonic parentage for Cain and Abel? Compare *Chronicle of Zuqnin* 1.62 lines 3-4: ܫܝܬ ܒܪܗ ܕܐܝܬ ܠܗ ܡܢ ܚܘܐ ܒܬܪ ܡܘܬܗ ܕܗܒܠ ܕܩܛܠ ܩܝܡܐ ܐܚܘܗܝ "Seth, his son whom he engendered after the death of Abel, whose brother Cain slew him."

[57]*Chronicle of Zuqnin* (ed. Chabot) 1.58 lines 7-22: ܗܘ ܕܐܡܪ ܠܗ ܐܠܗܐ ܠܐ ܬܣܒ ܐܢܬ ܐܠܐ ܒܙܝܥܐ ܕܐܦ ܒܟ ܐܢܐ ܐܫܪܐ ܘܐܦ ܒܙܪܥܟ ܐܢܐ ܐܫܪܐ ܘܐܦ ܒܙܪܥ ܙܪܥܟ ܐܢܐ ܐܫܪܐ ܘܐܦ ܒܙܪܥ ܙܪܥ ܙܪܥܟ ܐܢܐ ܐܫܪܐ ܘܐܦ ܒܙܪܥ ܙܪܥ ܙܪܥ ܙܪܥܟ ܐܢܐ ܐܫܪܐ ܘܐܦ ܒܙܪܥ ܙܪܥ ܙܪܥ ܙܪܥ ܙܪܥܟ ܐܢܐ ܐܫܪܐ ܘܐܦ ܒܙܪܥ ܙܪܥ ܙܪܥ ܙܪܥ ܙܪܥ ܙܪܥܟ ܐܢܐ ܐܫܪܐ ܘܐܦ ܒܙܪܥ ܙܪܥ ܙܪܥ ܙܪܥ ܙܪܥ ܙܪܥ ܙܪܥܟ ܐܢܐ ܐܫܪܐ ܘܐܦ ܒܙܪܥ ܙܪܥ ܙܪܥ ܙܪܥ ܙܪܥ ܙܪܥ ܙܪܥ ܙܪܥܟ ܐܢܐ ܐܫܪܐ ܘܐܦ ܒܙܪܥ ܙܪܥ ܙܪܥ ܙܪܥ ܙܪܥ ܙܪܥ ܙܪܥ ܙܪܥ ܙܪܥܟ ܐܢܐ ܐܫܪܐ ܘܐܦ ܒܙܪܥ ܙܪܥ ܙܪܥ ܙܪܥ ܙܪܥ ܙܪܥ ܙܪܥ ܙܪܥ

[59]Many of the surviving Christian *Adamschriften* portray Seth as Adam's literary executor; i.e., he records the testimonies and warnings of his father for the instruction of future generations. Any so-called "book of Seth" is thus stripped of independent authority by this clever rhetorical tactic.

[60]E.g., Dan 12:3; *2 Apoc. Bar.* 51:1-5; *1 Enoch* 71:1-14; *2 Enoch* 22:4-12 (long version); *3 Enoch* 4-12. For discussion and further references, see M. Himmelfarb, "Revelation and Rapture: The Transformation of the Visionary in the Ascent Apocalypses," *Mysteries and Revelations: Apocalyptic Studies since the Uppsala Colloquium* (JSPSup 9; ed. J.J. Collins and J.H. Charlesworth; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1991) 79-90.

[61]Note 1QH 3:19-22: אודכה אדוני כי פדיתה נפשי משחת ומשאול אבדון העליתני לרום עולם ואתהלכה במישור לאין חקר ואדעה כיא יש מקוה לאשר יצרתה מעפר לסוד עולם ורוח נעוה טהרתה מפשע רב להתיצב במעמד עם צבא קדושים ולבוא ביחד עם עדת בני שמים. See also the important observations of M. Himmelfarb, *Ascent to Heaven in Jewish and Christian Apocalypses* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1993) 47-71.

[62]See the passages cited in n.60 *supra.*

[63]*Allogenes* 58.27-33: "When <I> was taken by the eternal Light out of the garment that was upon me, and taken up to a holy place whose likeness can not be revealed in the world ...." Translation is that of *Nag Hammadi Library*[3] (ed. Robinson) 496. The "garment" shed is that of human flesh; its replacement, if any, is not indicated. It is thus possible that only an ecstatic experience is presupposed by this passage, analogous to the ones claimed by John of Patmos in Rev 4:1-2 or described by Paul in 2 Cor 12:1-4; see also *Zost.* 4.20-25. J.D. Turner argues that *Allogenes* employs a "Platonically inspired visionary ascent of the individual intellect in which it assimilates itself to the hierarchy of metaphysical levels with which it was aboriginally consubstantial ..."; see his "Sethian Gnosticism: A Literary History," *Nag Hammadi, Gnosticism, and Early Christianity* (ed. C.W. Hedrick and R. Hodgson, Jr.; Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1986) 81-82.

[64]See W. Adler, *Time Immemorial: Archaic History and its Sources in Christian Chronography from Julius Africanus to George Syncellus* (Dumbarton Oaks Studies 26; Washington, DC: Dumbarton Oaks Center for Byzantine Studies, 1989) 6-14, 80-97.

[65]Syncellus follows Septuagintal chronology in his recountal of the antediluvian generations. Since according to this scheme Seth was born in the 230th year of Adam, Seth was forty years old when he ascended to heaven.

[66]Syncellus, *Ecloga Chronigraphica* (ed. Mosshammer) 9.22-24: Τῷ σο΄ ἔτει τοῦ Ἀδὰμ *ὁ Σὴθ ἁρπαγεὶς ὑπὸ ἀγγέλων* ἐμυήθη τὰ περὶ τῆς παραβάσεως μέλλοντα ἔσεσθαι τῶν ἐγρηγόρων, καὶ τὰ περὶ τοῦ κατακλυσμοῦ τοῦ ὕδατος ἐσομένου καὶ τὰ περὶ τῆς παρουσίας τοῦ σωτῆρος. The same passage is transmitted by Cedrenus, who however reduces the number of angels involved to one. See Stroumsa, *Another Seed* 109-110; M.R. James, *The Lost Apocrypha of the Old Testament: Their Titles and Fragments* (London: SPCK, 1920) 9. Compare Syncellus, *Ecloga Chronographica* (ed. Mosshammer) 10.14-24 for an almost identical revelation vouchsafed to Adam.

[67]Syncellus, *Ecloga Chronographica* (ed. Mosshammer) 9.25-26. See Adler, *Time Immemorial* 138 n.32.

[68]Although it does state that Seth was pious and "well-formed" (9.26-27).

[69]So Stroumsa, *Another Seed* 110.

[70]E.g., *Vita Adae et Evae*, Syriac *Cave of Treasures*, the *Testament of Adam.* Compare Josephus, *Antiquities* 1.70.

[71]On this name see M. Lidzbarski, *Das Johannesbuch der Mandäer* (2 vols.; Giessen: A. Töpelmann, 1905-15) 2.119 n.3.

[72]Compare the analogous tradition which features Adam's attempt to outwit the angel of death that is transmitted within the late midrashic compilation attributed to R. Moshe ha-Darshan known as *Bereshit Rabbati.* See *Midrash Bereshit Rabbati* (ed. Ḥ. Albeck; Jerusalem: Mekitze Nirdamim, 1940) 24.22-23; 26.10-24.

[73]*Left Ginzā* 428.2-4 (ed. Lidzbarski). The translation of the final sentences is that of K. Rudolph, "Mandean Sources," *Gnosis, A Selection of Gnostic Texts II: Coptic and Mandean Sources* (ed. W. Foerster; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1974) 274. The seer of the Coptic *Zostrianos* tractate (NHC VIII.1) has a similar experience; see below.

[74]An angel of baptism normally paired with Nidbai. See *Ginzā* 602 (ed. Lidzbarski) *s.v.* Šilmai; Rudolph, "Mandean Sources" 277-78. Note also Theodore bar Konai, *Liber Scholiorum* (ed. Scher) 345.4; Nöldeke, *WZKM* 12 (1898) 356; Brandt, *Mandäische Religion* 198; Lidzbarski, *Johannesbuch* xx.

[75]*Left Ginzā* 429.3-11 (ed. Lidzbarski). Translation is that of G. Widengren, *Mesopotamian Elements in Manichaeism: Studies in Manichaean, Mandaean, and Syrian-Gnostic Religion* (Uppsala: A.-B. Lundequistska Bokhandeln, 1946) 151-52.

[76]See *Right Ginzā* 208.16-20; 209.3-7, 21-24, 31-36; 210.3-6 (ed. Lidzbarski).

[77]Translated from the Greek text, which reads: καὶ ἄνεμοι ἐν τῇ ὁράσει μου ἐξεπέτασάν με καὶ ἐπῆράν με ἄνω καὶ εἰσήνεγκάν με εἰς τὸν οὐρανόν (cited from *Apocalypsis Henochi Graece* [PVTG 3; ed. M. Black; Leiden: Brill, 1970] 28). See also *1 Enoch* 39:3; 52:1-2. Compare 2 Kgs 2:11b: ויעל אליהו בסערה השמים "and Elijah ascended *via a storm-wind* to heaven." Note also the references compiled in J.C. Reeves, "Jewish Pseudepigrapha in Manichaean Literature: The Influence of the Enochic Library," *Tracing the Threads: Studies in the Vitality of Jewish Pseudepigrapha* (SBLEJL 6; ed. J.C. Reeves; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1994) 199 n.53.

[78]Compare *Left Ginzā* 573.13-21 (ed. Lidzbarski).

[79]See Abraham ibn Ezra *ad* Ps 73:24, who perceptively invokes the example of Enoch in his discussion of this verse.

[80]The use of עצה here in the sense of "conclave, council" (note the LXX: ἐν τῇ βουλῇ σου ὡδήγησάς με ...) presages the way the term is often employed in the Qumran scrolls. See, e.g., 1QS 1:8, 10; 2:25; 5:7; 7:22; 8:5, 22; 1QSa 1:27; 2:2, 9, 11, along with the observations of A. Dupont-Sommer, *The Jewish Sect of Qumran and the Essenes: New Studies on the Dead Sea Scrolls* (New York: Macmillan, 1955) 63-64; idem, *The Essene Writings from Qumran* (reprinted, Gloucester, MA: Peter Smith, 1973) 43; E. Qimron, *The Hebrew of the Dead Sea Scrolls* (HSS 29; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1986) 112.

[81]M.A. Knibb, "1 Enoch," *AOT* (Sparks) 255. Although the actual means of transport differs, note also *Apoc. Abr.* 10:4; 11:1; 15:2-5.

[82]Translation is that of Charles-Barton, *AOT* (Sparks) 796-97. Compare the language of *3 Enoch* 41:3: ... ותפשני בידו והעלני בכנפיו והראני את אותן "and he (Metatron) grasped me (R. Ishmael) with his hand and carried me aloft with his wings, and showed them to me ..."; also 42:2. Text cited from Ms. Vat. 228 (ed. Schäfer §59). Note also *1 Enoch* 65:9, where Enoch anticipates his future role as Metatron before Noah.

[83]*Kephalaia* 38.20 states that the "first right hand" was the one extended to Primal Man by the Mother of Life prior to his disastrous defeat and capture. See *CMC* 19.4-7, quoted below. Note also *Acta Archelai* 7.4 (= Epiphanius, *Panarion* 66.25.7) for a

similar depiction of the redemption of Primal Man, as well as our fuller discussion in Chapter Six below.

[84]See H.-C. Puech, *Le manichéisme: son fondateur - sa doctrine* (Paris: Civilisations du Sud, 1949) 182-83 n.366.

[85]K. Rudolph, *Die Mandäer* (2 vols.; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1960-61) 1.190, esp. 2.140-49; idem, *Gnosis: The Nature and History of Gnosticism* (San Francisco: Harper & Row, 1983) 361; Brandt, *Mandäische Religion* 110-12.

[86]*Left Ginzā* 498.20-22 (ed. Lidzbarski): *ligṯ̲ biaminḥ̲ ladam usliq tirsḥ̲ bškinṯ̲ dukta ddairia rbia.* Text cited from the transcription of Rudolph, *Theogonie* 324.

[87]*Left Ginzā* 571.13-20 (ed. Lidzbarski). Compare the translation (with a transcription of the text) of Rudolph, *Theogonie* 324.

[88]Note also *CMC* 19.4-7: ἐκ τοῦ π(ατ)ρ(ὸ)ς τοῦ ἡμετέρου *καὶ τῆς ἀποπρὸ πρώτης δεξιᾶς ἀγαθῆς* "from our Father *and the distant, first, good right hand.*" See the references supplied by Henrichs-Koenen, *ZPE* 19 (1975) 21 n.46. Cf. *Odes Sol.* 14:4; *Psalm-Book* 2.5.

[89]For the occurrence of this motif within a "Sethian" ideology, see the 'Audian *Apocalypse of Abraham*: ܥܠܡܐ ܕܐܬܒܪܝ ܘܫܬ ܫܠܝ ܒܗ ܘܫܬ ܥܒܕ ܚܫܘܟܐ ܘܒܪܝܬܐ ܕܥܠܡܐ ܐܬܒܪܝ ܘܫܬ "The world and the created order were made by Darkness and six other powers" (Theodore bar Konai, *Liber Scholiorum* [ed. Scher] 320.2-3). The connection of this 'Audian text with Sethian gnosticism is confirmed by Epiphanius, *Panarion* 39.5.1, which testifies that "they [Sethians] composed ... an apocalypse attributed to Abraham."

[90]*Nag Hammadi Library*[3] (ed. Robinson) 404-405.

[91]B.A. Pearson, "The Figure of Seth in Gnostic Literature," *Gnosticism, Judaism, and Egyptian Christianity* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1990) 77-79.

[92]Text translated from the Eastern manuscript tradition presented in *La Caverne des Trésors: les deux recensions syriaques* (CSCO 486, scrip. syri t. 207; ed. S.-M. Ri; Louvain: E. Peeters, 1987) 48 lines 2-4 (6.2-3 according to the stichometry of P. Riessler, *Altjüdisches Schrifttum ausserhalb der Bibel* [Augsburg: B. Filser Verlag, 1928] 942-1013): ܕܐܝܟ ܕܒܪ ܐܢܫ ܐܝܬ ܠܗ ܡܠܟ ܕܫܡ ܐܠ ܕܐܝܬ ܠܗ ܡܠܟ ܕܫܡ ܐܠ ܐܠܐ ܐܠ ܕܐܝܬ ܠܗ ܡܠܟ ܕܫܡ ܐܠ ܐܠ ܕܐܝܬ ܠܗ ܡܠܟ ܕܫܡ ܐܠ ܐܠ ܐܠ ܕܐܝܬ ܠܗ ܡܠܟ ܕܫܡ ܐܠ ܐܠ ܐܠ ܐܠ ܕܐܝܬ ܠܗ ܡܠܟ ܕܫܡ ܐܠ ܐܠ ܐܠ ܐܠ ܐܠ ܕܐܝܬ ܠܗ ܡܠܟ ܕܫܡ ܐܠ ܐܠ ܐܠ ܐܠ ܐܠ ܐܠ ܕܐܝܬ ܠܗ ܡܠܟ ܕܫܡ ܐܠ ܐܠ ܐܠ ܐܠ ܐܠ ܐܠ ܐܠ ܕܐܝܬ ܠܗ ܡܠܟ ܕܫܡ ܐܠ ܐܠ ܐܠ ܐܠ ܐܠ ܐܠ ܐܠ ܐܠ ܕܐܝܬ ܠܗ ܡܠܟ ܕܫܡ ܐܠ ܐܠ ܐܠ ܐܠ ܐܠ ܐܠ ܐܠ ܐܠ ܐܠ ܕܐܝܬ ܠܗ ܡܠܟ ܕܫܡ ܐܠ ܐܠ ܐܠ ܐܠ ܐܠ ܐܠ ܐܠ ܐܠ ܐܠ ܐܠ ܕܐܝܬ ܠܗ ܡܠܟ ܕܫܡ ܐܠ ܐܠ ܐܠ ܐܠ ܐܠ ܐܠ ܐܠ ܐܠ ܐܠ ܐܠ ܐܠ ܕܐܝܬ ܠܗ ܡܠܟ ܕܫܡ ܐܠ ܐܠ ܐܠ ܐܠ ܐܠ ܐܠ ܐܠ ܐܠ ܐܠ ܐܠ ܐܠ ܐܠ ܕܐܝܬ ܠܗ ܡܠܟ ܕܫܡ ܐܠ ܐܠ ܐܠ ܐܠ ܐܠ ܐܠ ܐܠ ܐܠ ܐܠ ܐܠ ܐܠ ܐܠ ܐܠ ܕܐܝܬ ܠܗ ܡܠܟ ܕܫܡ ܐܠ ܐܠ ܐܠ ܐܠ ܐܠ ܐܠ ܐܠ ܐܠ ܐܠ ܐܠ ܐܠ ܐܠ ܐܠ ܐܠ ܕܐܝܬ ܠܗ ܡܠܟ ܕܫܡ ܐܠ ܐܠ ܐܠ ܐܠ ܐܠ ܐܠ ܐܠ ܐܠ ܐܠ ܐܠ ܐܠ ܐܠ ܐܠ ܐܠ ܐܠ ܕܐܝܬ ܠܗ ܡܠܟ ܕܫܡ ܐܠ

[110]*Ginzā* 601 (ed. Lidzbarski) *s.v.* Oṣar-Hai; 602 *s.v.* Sīmath-Haijē; 613 *s.v.* Schatz des Lebens. "Treasure/y of Life" was the title of one of the canonical works authored by Mani; see Reeves, *Jewish Lore* 10-19, 36 nn.24-25.

[111]See *Right Ginzā* 202.26 (ed. Lidzbarski) and *passim* in the Coptic *Pistis Sophia*, a text that displays great affinity with Syro-Mesopotamian systems. On the latter nexus note Bousset, *Hauptprobleme* 180 n.1; I.P. Couliano, *The Tree of Gnosis: Gnostic Mythology from Early Christianity to Modern Nihilism* (San Francisco: HarperCollins, 1992) 31, 103, 167.

[112]The employment of this particular term is significant. According to Epiphanius (*Panarion* 19.2.2), the name Ἠλξαΐ (i.e., Elchasai) signified "hidden power, for *ēl* means 'power' and *xai* 'hidden'" (δύναμιν ἀποκεκαλυμμένην, διὰ τὸ ἦλ καλεῖσθαι δύναμιν, ξαῖ δὲ κεκαλυμμένον). Compare also Acts 8:9-10, where Simon Magus is termed *ἡ δύναμις* τοῦ θεοῦ ἡ καλουμένη Μεγάλη. Cf. *CMC* 13.5-6, 11.

[113]*Book of the Bee* (ed. Budge) 90.5-6: ܟܬܒ ܐܡܪ ܐܡ ܟܬܒ ܫܠ ܡܠ ܟܬܒ ܒ ܡܢ ܟܬܒ ܐܡܪ.

[114]Ibid. 90.17-18: ܒ ܫܠ ܐܡܪ ܟܬܒ.

[115]Boyce-Grenet, *History of Zoroastrianism* 451. See also M. Boyce, *Textual Sources for the Study of Zoroastrianism* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1984) 90-91.

CHAPTER FIVE

THE APOCALYPSE OF ENOSH

Text

πάλιν ἐν τῇ ἀποκαλύψει τοῦ Ἐνῶς οὕτως λέγει· ἐν τῷ τρίτῳ ἔτει καὶ ἐν τῷ μηνὶ τῷ δεκάτῳ ἐξῆλθον εἰς περίπατον εἰς τὴν γῆν τῆς ἐρήμου λογιζόμενος κατὰ τὴν φρόνησιν περὶ τε τοῦ [οὐ]ραν[ο]ῦ καὶ τῆς γῆς καὶ [περὶ πάντω]ν τῶν ἔργων [καὶ πραγμάτω]ν ποίῳ λό[γῳ διὰ τίνος] καὶ τῇ τί[νος βουλήσει γεγό]νασιν. [τότε δ' ἐφάνη μοι ἄγγ]ε[λος· ἐδίδαξε δέ με περ]ὶ [τοῦδε τοῦ κόσμου τοῦ θ]ανάτου. καὶ ἥρπασεν σὺμ μεγίστῃ ἡσυχίαι. ἡ δὲ καρδία μου ἐβαρεῖτο, ἐτρόμησεν δὲ καὶ τὰ μέλη μου πάντα καὶ οἱ σφόνδυλοι τοῦ νώτου μου ἐκινήθησαν πρὸς τῆς σφοδρότητος, καὶ οἱ πόδες μου ἐπὶ τοὺς ἀστραγάλους οὐχ εἱστήκεισαν. ἀπῆλθον δὲ εἰς συχνὰς πεδιάδας καὶ εἶδον ἐκεῖ ὄρη ὑψηλότατα. καὶ ἥρπασε δὲ με τὸ πν(εῦμ)α καὶ ἀνήνεγκέ με εἰς τὸ ὄρος ἐν δυνάμει ἡσύχῳ. κἀκεῖ μοι ἀπεκ[αλύ]φ[θησαν πολ]λαὶ καὶ μεγ[άλαι ὄψεις]. πάλιν εἶ[πεν ὅτι ὁ ἄγγε]λος κα[..... ....] δε[..... ....] τ[..... ..... καὶ ἀπή]ν[εγκέ με εἰς κλίμα τὸ ἀρ]κτῷον καὶ ἐθεώρησα ἐκεῖσε ὄρη ὑπερμεγέθη καὶ ἀγγέλους καὶ τόπους πολλούς. διελάλησεν δέ μοι καὶ εἶπεν· ὁ ἰσχυρότατος τὴν ὑπεροχὴν ἀπέστειλέ με πρὸς σέ, ἵνα σοι ἀποκαλύψω τὰ ἀπόρρητα ἃ ἐνεθυμήθης, ἐπειδήπερ ἐξελέγης εἰς τὴν ἀλήθειαν. ταῦτα δὲ πάντα τὰ ἀπόκρυφα γράψον ἐπὶ πτύχας χαλκᾶς καὶ ἀπόθου ἐν τῇ γῇ τῆς ἐρήμου. πάντα δὲ ἃ γράφεις προδηλότα[τα γρά]ψον. ἑτοίμως γὰρ [ἔχει ἡ ἀποκάλ]υψις αὕ[τη ἡ ἐμή, ἣ οὐ] τελευτᾷ [εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα, ἀπο]καλυ[φθῆναι τοῖς ἀδελ]φοῖς [..... ....]ς πᾶ[σι. πολλὰ δὲ καὶ ἄλλα ὑ]πάρχει τούτοις ἐοικότα ἐν ταῖς γραφαῖς αὐτοῦ ὑποδεικνύοντα περὶ τῆς αὐτοῦ ἁρπαγῆς καὶ ἀποκαλύψεως. πάντα γὰρ ἃ ἤκουσεν καὶ εἶδεν γράψας κατέλειψεν τοῖς μεταγενεστέροις πᾶσι τοῦ τῆς ἀληθείας πνεύματος.[1]

Translation

Moreover it says thusly in the apocalypse of Enosh: 'In the tenth month of the third year I went out to walk in the wilderness, considering mentally

[he]aven and earth and [all] works [and deed]s (wondering) b[y whose will] they exist. [Then there appeared to me an angel. He taught me about the world of de]ath. He took me up with great silence. My heart became heavy, all my limbs trembled, and the vertebrae of my back shook violently, and my feet could not stand upon their joints. I went forth to a flat plain and saw there lofty mountains. The spirit seized me and brought me with silent power to a mountain. There num[erous awes]ome [visions were rev]ealed to me.'

Moreover [he says that 'the an]gel ... [and brought me to the] nort[hern region] where I beheld immense mountains and angels and many places. He spoke to me and said: 'The Pre-Eminent Almighty One has sent me to you so that I might reveal to you the secret (things) which you contemplated, since indeed you have chosen truth. Write down all these hidden things upon bronze tablets and deposit (them) in the wilderness. Everything which you write recor[d most p]lainly (carefully?). For [my] revela[tion, which shall not] pass away, is ready [to be] reve[aled to] al[l the breth]ren ....'

[Many other] things similar to these are in his writings (which) set forth his ascension and revelation, for everything that he heard and saw he recorded (and) left behind for the subsequent generations, all those belonging to the spirit of truth.

Commentary

πάλιν ἐν τῇ ἀποκαλύψει τοῦ Ἐνῶς οὕτως λέγει· "Moreover it says thusly in the apocalypse of Enosh ...." An explicit appeal to a revelatory book allegedly authored by the forefather Enosh, who according to Gen 4:26 was the biological son of Seth, is particularly intriguing. Written works specifically ascribed to Enosh are seldom remarked among the postbiblical discussions of early literary activity by biblical figures. Jewish tradition is silent about Enosh's active involvement in the production of written literature,[2] perhaps reflecting the popularity of that scriptural exegesis which concluded that Enosh was the first idolator to appear upon earth.[3] Early Christian and gnostic trajectories likewise display little interest in his possible intellectual accomplishments, viewing him solely as the conduit by which the purported writings of Adam and Seth reached later figures such as Enoch or Noah. Nevertheless, some testimony does survive regarding Enosh as author. The Armenian historian Moses of Chorene mentions that two inscriptions containing revelatory knowledge were erected by Enosh,[4] but this witness possesses little independent value, as it is simply a garbled summary of what Josephus reports of the efforts of the "descendants of Seth" in his *Antiquities* (1.69-71). Solomon of Basra's thirteenth-century *Book of the Bee* states that "some say that he (Enosh) was the first to author books on the courses of the stars and zodiacal signs,"[5] a discovery whose promulgation is usually attributed to either Enoch or Seth. Hence a similar confusion of roles may lie behind this particular tradition as well.[6]

R. Reitzenstein long ago advanced the notion that a so-called "Enôš-Apokalypse," no longer extant in its original form, must have served as the literary nucleus around which the final portions of the first two tractates of the Mandaean *Right Ginzā* were constructed.[7] This hypothetical source, which was produced in Palestine during the first century CE, depicted the advent of an authentic divine emissary (Anōš-'Uthra) in Jerusalem to mark the imminence of the eschaton. Moreover, Reitzenstein suggested that portions of this same document might be embedded within certain traditions found in the synoptic gospels saying-source Q. While some scholars once eagerly embraced Reitzenstein's proposals regarding possible connections between Mandaeism and nascent Christianity,[8] most today would dismiss his arguments as hopelessly speculative. However, it is intriguing that thanks to the discovery of the *Cologne Mani Codex*, we are now in possession of an actual citation which purportedly stems from an "Enôš-Apokalypse," even though the setting and contents of this latter snippet do not easily cohere with those postulated by Reitzenstein.

Significantly, it is within Mandaeism, a prominent Syro-Mesopotamian gnostic movement possessing discernible links with late antique Judaism, that Enosh achieves renown as an independent author whose writings transmit authoritative knowledge which he procured from the heavenly realms. The eleventh book of the *Right Ginzā* is introduced as "the mystery and book of the great Anōš, son of the great Šitil, son of the great Adam, son of the mighty *'uthras* of glory."[9] The epithet "great Enosh" (*anuš rba*) parallels the syntagms "great Šitil" and "great Adam" and indicates his eventual status as a heavenly *'uthra*, whereas the phrase "lesser Enosh" (*anuš zuṭa*) designates his material manifestation as the biological son of Seth.[10] Despite its superscription, the book's primary focus is a series of catastrophes wrought upon the earth and its inhabitants by the demonness Rūhā and her cohorts during the successive eras of the apostles Hibil (Abel), Šitil (Seth), and Enosh. The cataclysms are respectively characterized as those of "sword, fire, and water,"[11] the last-named being explicitly associated with Enosh.[12] Enosh escapes harm due to his fortuitous removal from earth by Mandā de-Ḥayyē, an emissary of the principal Mandaean deity, who installs him in the supernal realms, where he continues to reside.[13] The initial portion of the twelfth book of the *Right Ginzā* continues the first-person discursive style displayed in the preceding composition, identifying the speaker as "the great Anōš, the son of the great Šitil, the son of the great Adam ...."[14] Therein Enosh provides testimony regarding many of the sights which he beheld during his tour of the heavens and describes his own installation as an *'uthra* of Light.

The aforementioned Mandaean traditions preserved in the *Right Ginzā* provides us with valuable comparative evidence for the assessment of the "apocalypse" contained in the *Codex*, and relevant passages from the *Ginzā* will figure prominently in our discussion below. The implications of such a nexus, should such prove the case, are significant. The antiquity of the Mandaean textual corpus is a notorious *crux*, one that is complicated by the visibly complex redactional history and relative youth of the extant manuscript tradition. If a clear connection can be established between the

Codex passage and the Mandaean Enosh material, an important step would be taken toward an improved understanding of the religio-historical relationships linking a number of Syro-Mesopotamian religious communities.

ἐν τῷ τρίτῳ ἔτει καὶ ἐν τῷ μηνὶ τῷ δεκάτῳ ἐξῆλθον εἰς περίπατον εἰς τὴν γῆν τῆς ἐρήμου "In the tenth month of the third year I went out to walk in the wilderness ...." Unlike the other pseudepigraphic quotations cited in this section of the *Codex*, the Enosh fragment is tied to a fixed temporal context. However, the fragment fails to include an explanation of the grounding of its chronological sequencing. The "third year" reckoned from what starting point? From a previous angelophany vouchsafed to Enosh? From the removal and/or death of his father Seth? Neither biblical nor extrabiblical traditions provide cogent clues for the resolution of this difficulty. In fact, the truncated character of this setting points to the possibility that the extant fragment may have been wrenched from a larger work wherein certain narrative events were arranged along one or more chronological axes, such as an expanded "chronicle" of antediluvian "history" along the lines of the initial chapters of *Jubilees* or the Syriac *Cave of Treasures*. Alternatively, this temporal ambiguity may signal carelessness on the part of the fragment's actual author, revealing an *ad hoc* construction designed to flesh out the sequence of authentic heralds.

The spatial setting for Enosh's angelophany is the "wilderness." The significance of the wilderness as a favored locale for divine-human interaction has enjoyed a vogue in biblical studies, despite the trenchant criticism that has been leveled against this conception.[15] It is unclear whether Enosh craves a numinous encounter, and hence directs his steps into the wilderness in order to facilitate such a meeting,[16] or whether the experience is purely fortuitous. An analogous setting figures at the beginning of the Coptic treatise *Zostrianos* (NHC VIII.1). Therein the protagonist, like Enosh, removes himself to the desert where he is then met by "the angel of the knowledge of eternal light," but in this work the initial motivation of Zostrianos hardly coheres with what is discernible from the Enosh fragment: "Then, as I (Zostrianos) was deeply troubled and gloomy because of the discouragement which encompassed me, I dared to act and to deliver myself to the wild beasts of the desert for a violent death."[17] No analogous depression or mental funk seems to afflict Enosh in our fragment.

λογιζόμενος κατὰ τὴν φρόνησιν περὶ τε τοῦ [οὐ]ρανο[ῦ] καὶ τῆς γῆς καὶ [περὶ πάντω]ν τῶν ἔργων [καὶ πραγμάτω]ν ποίῳ λό[γῳ διὰ τίνος] καὶ τῇ τί[νος βουλήσει γεγό]νασιν "considering mentally [he]aven and earth and [al]l works [and deed]s (wondering) b[y whose will] they exist." Although the precise wording of this passage relies upon the suggested restorations of the *Codex*'s modern editors, their readings are plausible. The subsequent "apocalypse of Shem" constructs a similar setting for its hero: "I was thinking about the way that all things came to be. While I pondered (these things) ..." (ἐλογιζόμην περὶ πάντων τῶν ἔργων ποίῳ τρόπῳ ἐγένοντο. ἐμοῦ δὲ διαλογιζομένου ...).[18] Henrichs and Koenen call attention to several other literary passages wherein an

angelic being responds to a mental state of contemplative musing. They point to the opening scene of the *Shepherd of Hermas*, where Hermas is portrayed "glorifying the creation of God, for its greatness and splendour and might" while on the road to Cumae.[19] However, apart from a common focus upon the order of creation, the suggested parallel is remote. Hermas praises the mighty works of a known Creator, but Enosh is touchingly innocent of the very existence of a demiurgic entity, whether providential or malevolent. More pertinent is their invocation of the initial lines of the hermetic *Poimandres* tractate (*C.H.* I). The visionary there is "occupied with thought about the existents" (*C.H.* I.1), and when Poimandres appears the visionary states to him: "I want to learn about the existents, to think of their nature, and to become acquainted with god" (*C.H.* I.3).[20] In both instances (i.e., that of Enosh and of the anonymous visionary of *Poimandres*), the focus of meditation is the structure of the cosmos and the ultimate reasons governing its existence.

As B.L. Visotzky has perceptively observed, the subject of Enosh's reverie is remarkably similar to an esoteric topic of study termed within Jewish tradition מעשה בראשית, or the "work(s) of creation."[21] Remarkably little is known with certainty about this hermeneutical endeavor, thanks to a mishnaic warning (*m. Ḥag.* 2:1) against its indiscriminate dissemination, although the later medieval-era tractates *Sefer Yeṣirah, Sefer ha-Bahir*, and *Midrash Konen* are undoubtedly representative of the types of speculation indulged by its practitioners.[22] Judging from these works, the study featured a close reading and exegesis of those biblical verses considered to be crucial for a proper understanding of the preternatural processes involved in the generation and structuring of the cosmos. A similar interest in cosmogonic and cosmological speculation, also rooted in biblical traditions, is exhibited in both classical and Syro-Mesopotamian gnostic circles. The portrayal of Enosh in this fragment thus dovetails nicely with the contemplative focus of the religious milieu presumably responsible for its construction.

The Mandaean "book of Anōš" seems cognizant of this same interpretive stream that specifically ascribes to Enosh a meditative contemplation of the mysteries of creation prior to the sudden manifestation of a revealor-figure. Enosh considers

> the whole world—heaven, the stars, sun and moon, the angels appointed to oversee heaven and earth, the twelve constellations of the zodiac across which sun and moon travel, the angels appointed over water, wind, and fire, what the earth is founded upon, mountains, seas, fruits, grape-clusters, and trees. (Enosh asks): Who will tell me about these things, (such as) from where do they come? Upon what are they based? How did they come to be?[23]

After concluding that the created order apparently emanates from evil powers bent upon the enslavement of humanity, and while bewailing his entrapment among them, Enosh is graced with an angelophany. Mandā de-Ḥayyē reveals himself to Enosh with a promise of deliverance, furthermore revealing to him the "secrets of heaven and earth" (*Right Ginzā* 264.4ff. [ed. Lidzbarski]). Although the contents diverge, the structure of this Mandaean narrative closely parallels the sequence of events contained within the *Codex*

"apocalypse." This correspondence of motifs centered upon the figure of Enosh suggests the conscious development of a relatively fixed group of traditions around that character (an Enosh-complex?), perhaps in deliberate imitation of the *topoi* already circulating about his progenitors Adam and Seth.

[τότε δ' ἐφάνη μοι ἄγγ]ε[λος· ἐδίδαξε δέ με περ]ὶ [τοῦδε τοῦ κόσμου τοῦ θ]ανάτου. καὶ ἥρπασεν σὺμ μεγίστῃ ἡσυχίαι "[Then there appeared to me an angel. He taught me about the world of de]ath. He took me up with great silence." This passage is badly damaged, and the modern editors of the critical edition of the *Codex* have suggested the above restorations, basing themselves primarily upon Enoch's alleged vision of a "world of death" in *CMC* 59.22-23.[24] While the word "death" is an extremely plausible reading in the present context, its actual occurrence in the later Enoch fragment is conjectural, not certain. Obviously some being does reveal itself to Enosh at this lacunal point in the narrative, one who moreover *silently* removes him from his terrestrial situation. How this entity's muteness accords with a suggested didactic mission in the proffered restoration ("he taught me ...") remains unexplained by the editors.

Assuming that the word "death" is correctly rendered at this juncture of the Enosh fragment, it seems possible that the damaged phrase may have provided a clue as to the identity of the emissary dispatched to Enosh. In an analogous context within Mandaean literature, Ṣaurēl, termed the "angel of death," is sent to fetch the soul of Adam. Adam however refuses to depart the earth, suggesting instead that his son Šitil should take his place. Šitil eventually agrees to this bargain, enjoys a tour of the heavenly plane, and is rewarded with a permanent residence in the marvelous Realm of Light.[25] Similar narrative scenarios occur in certain strands of Jewish literature. The "angel of death" (מלאך המות) comes to effect the physical death of Abraham (*T. Abr.* 16-20 [A]; 12-14 [B]),[26] Moses (*Deut. Rab.* 11 and parallels),[27] or Joshua b. Levi (*Maaseh de-R. Joshua b. Levi*).[28] Each of these righteous individuals, like Adam in the *Ginzā*, initially resists the summons. Each moreover is treated to a tour of the contents of heaven, although the tour is not always directly connected with the visit of the "angel of death." Each finally (albeit reluctantly) accedes to the necessity of corporeal death, usually after one or more comic adventures or verbal exchanges.

However, it is clear from the succeeding narrative that the purpose of the angel's visit is not to remove Enosh permanently from mortal society. Instead, the sights which he beholds during his ascent-experience are to be carefully recorded in written form and archived in a safe location "in the wilderness" (*CMC* 54.14-15) in order to educate future generations of humanity, "all those belonging to the spirit of truth" (*CMC* 55.8-9). His sojourn in heaven is thus a temporary one, analogous to the experience predicated of Adam in *CMC* 48.16-50.7 above, or of Enoch in *Jub.* 4:17-23. It is therefore unlikely that the anonymous guiding angel of this fragment is the "angel of death"; the significance of the word in its present context remains enigmatic.

ἡ δὲ καρδία μου ἐβαρεῖτο, ἐτρόμησεν δὲ καὶ τὰ μέλη μου πάντα καὶ οἱ σφόνδυλοι τοῦ νώτου μου ἐκινήθησαν πρὸς τῆς σφοδρότητος, καὶ οἱ πόδες μου ἐπὶ τοὺς ἀστραγάλους οὐχ εἱστήκεισαν "My heart became heavy, all my limbs trembled, and the vertebrae of my back shook violently, and my feet could not stand upon their joints." A similar bodily reaction to the sudden appearance of the angel figures in the subsequent "apocalypse" of Shem. There Shem responds to the radiant manifestation of a "mighty angel" as follows: "Then the feature(s) of my face changed so that I collapsed upon the ground. The vertebrae of my back shook, and my feet could not stand upon the joints."[29] While the emotional "disposition of the recipient" is frequently remarked during the initial stages of an apocalyptic revelation,[30] it is nonetheless rare that the seer's corporeal agitation is articulated in such graphic detail. I. Gruenwald has gone so far as to remark that "the phrase 'my feet did not stand upon their pins' is rather unusual and is not known from any other mystical text."[31] Such an assertion however is in fact erroneous.

Very close parallels to the particular roster of physical tremors catalogued in the *Codex* "apocalypses" of Enosh and Shem occur in the Mandaean "book of Anōš." After contemplating the structure and constituents of the created order, and then concluding that the world was governed by evil powers, Enosh reports: "When I saw that the world was created thusly, I *trembled and shook*, and my body, which had been straight, was bent. Groans came forth from *my heart, my feet quaked, and they could not stand firmly in their places*."[32] Mandā de-Ḥayyē then appears and asks Enosh: "Little Enosh,[33] why are you frightened? Why do you shake and tremble? Why is your body bent, why does your heart groan, and why do your feet quake in their places?"[34] The amazingly close correspondence in language between the *Codex* passage and the Mandaean texts is extraordinary, bolstering the growing suspicion that they derive from a common textual corpus. Yet another instance of the same anatomical diction is found in the twelfth book of the *Right Ginzā*, where Enosh is also the speaker: "When I saw that being of Light, *my body quaked and trembled, and my feet could not stand in their places*. I collapsed and fell down in front of him" (270.4-6 [ed. Lidzbarski]). This latter instance is in fact even nearer in form to the scenes described in the *Codex*, for here as there the nuanced paroxysms of the seer are in response to the sudden manifestation of a heavenly being.

This common verbal articulation of the physical symptoms afflicting Enosh during his reception of a heavenly vision further cements the kinship which we have been positing between the pseudepigraphic "apocalypse" of Enosh and the Mandaean "book of Anōš." Close study of the language and ideology of this "apocalypse" hence has significance not only for the literary and cultural development of biblically-based pseudepigrapha, but also possesses suggestive implications for the reconstruction of the literary history of Mandaeism.

ἀπῆλθον δὲ εἰς συχνὰς πεδιάδας καὶ εἶδον ἐκεῖ ὄρη ὑψηλότατα "I went forth to a flat plain and saw there lofty mountains." This is a puzzling statement. Immediately after recounting his bodily paralysis due to the sight of the angel, Enosh now speaks of a journey "to a flat plain" from which high mountains rise. One would expect instead at this narrative juncture a message of encouragement from the angel, coupled with some concrete gesture that rehabilitates Enosh's precarious physical condition in order to prepare him for further events. Yet there is no mention of the angel's presence with Enosh during his sojourn upon the plain. Moreover, the immediately following passage of the "apocalypse" speaks of a "spirit" that suddenly seizes Enosh and transports him "with silent power" to the summit of a mountain, where many secrets are then revealed to him.

This peculiar sequence of narrative events—(1) an ascent (2) the recipient's visceral reaction to the sight beheld (3) an incongruous travelogue (4) followed by an ascent—raises the suspicion that two variant versions of the ascent of Enosh have been clumsily combined by a subsequent textual redactor (Baraies?). In each version the agent effecting Enosh's ascent accomplishes this feat "silently" (for this odd characterization recurs in both descriptions of his ascent), but in one account the visitor is identified as "the spirit" (τό πνεῦμα), while in the other it is (arguably) an "angel." If such is the case, the present sentence about Enosh's journey on the plain may either supplement or parallel the opening scene of the "apocalypse" regarding his initial meditative peregrination in the wilderness.

On the other hand, in the interest of preserving literary integrity, one could conceivably interpret the ascent of Enosh as proceeding in two stages. Enosh is first raised to the "flat plain," and then the "spirit" (perhaps understood as an alternate designation for the revealing "angel")[35] transports him to the mountain. Interestingly, 1QH 3:19-22 also depicts one portion of the celestial world as "a plain of limitless expanse" (מישור לאין חקר) where the seer enjoys communion with the angelic hosts, but no "mountains" figure in the description provided by this Qumran source.[36] Mountains however do form an important part of the supernal "landscape" viewed by the forefather Enoch during his tour of the heavenly heights (*1 Enoch* 21-36). The underworld is situated beneath "a large and high mountain" in the west (*1 Enoch* 22:1-5). Another locale features "seven magnificent mountains," each comprised of precious stones, and one of which will serve as the throne of God's impending judgment (*1 Enoch* 24-25; cf. 18:6-9). Seven "spice mountains" are traversed travelling eastward before reaching the "garden of righteousness" (*1 Enoch* 32:1-3; cf. 77:4).

καὶ ἥρπασε δὲ με τὸ πν(εῦμ)α καὶ ἀνήνεγκέ με εἰς τὸ ὄρος ἐν δυνάμει ἡσύχῳ. κἀκεῖ μοι ἀπεκ[αλύ]φ[θησαν πολ]λαὶ καὶ μεγ[άλαι ὄψεις] "The spirit seized me and brought me with silent power to a mountain. There num[erous awes]ome [visions were rev]ealed to me." Mountains frequently figure as the sites of revelatory events in so-called "gnostic apocalypses,"[37] although usually those individuals experiencing the epiphany are already upon the mountain when

the event transpires.[38] Here Enosh is supernaturally transported (καὶ ἥρπασε δὲ με ... καὶ ἀνήνεγκέ με) to the unnamed peak which serves as the site of revelation. So too the so-called "Living S[pirit]" whisks Shem to "[the summit] of a lof[ty] mountain" prior to the descent before that forefather of the throne-room of God.[39] The language employed in the introduction to the Transfiguration pericope of the synoptic Gospels is similar: *καὶ ἀναφέρει* αὐτοὺς *εἰς ὄρος* ὑψηλόν ... "and he (Jesus) brought them to a high mountain ..." (Mark 9:2//Matt 17:1; cf. Luke 9:28). This influential scene, fraught with significance for the issue of identity, perhaps served as a verbal template for the wording of these *Codex* passages. One might also compare *1 Enoch* 17:2, a text introducing what appears to be an abbreviated account of Enoch's trip through the celestial heights: "And they (the guiding angels) led me to a place of storm, and to a mountain the tip of whose summit reached to heaven. And I saw ...."[40] Here, as in the Enosh fragment, the forefather is whisked by heavenly entities to the peak of a mountain which then serves as the stage for subsequent revelations.

Another text which exploits the "angelophany on a mountain" motif is the so-called *Aramaic Levi* document, sizeable portions of which have been recovered from Qumran and the Cairo Genizah.[41] Of Second Temple provenance, this intriguing pseudepigraphon seeks to ground and expand the biblically ordained priestly prerogatives of the tribe of Levi by the literary artifice of an autobiographical account wherein their eponymous ancestor describes his supernatural election and installation. Central to this strategy is an ascent-experience, whose surviving lines are as follows:[42]

אדין חזיון אחזית[
בחזית חזויא וחזית שמ[יא ..... טורא]
תחותי רם עד דבק לשמ[א
לי תרעי שמיא ומלאך חד]

Then I beheld a vision [
in the seeing of the vision, and I saw the heav[ens ...
... a mountain]
beneath me rising up to the heaven[s
to me the gates of the heavens, and an angel [

Although somewhat damaged, this text can be reliably supplemented and readily understood with the aid of the later Greek *Testament of Levi*, a work which has demonstrably used the *Aramaic Levi* document as a source in its own construction. *T. Levi* 2:5-6 represents the parallel passage: τότε ἐπέπεσεν ἐπ' ἐμὲ ὕπνος, καὶ ἐθεασάμην ὄρος ὑψηλόν· ...[43] καὶ ἰδοὺ ἠνεῴχθησαν οἱ οὐρανοί, καὶ ἄγγελος θεοῦ εἶπε πρός με· Λευί, εἴσελθε "Then sleep fell upon me, and I saw a high mountain, [and I was upon it.] And behold the heavens were opened, and an angel of God said to me, Levi, enter!"[44] While the Greek and Aramaic recensions diverge regarding the precise character of the experience (was it a waking or a dream-vision?), a "mountain" plays a prominent role in both accounts, providing the vehicle by which Levi is able to step into heaven.

In the Enosh fragment, the mountain is simply the locale where the subsequent revelations are proffered. The actual means of ascent is via "the spirit,"[45] which as we suggested above in light of the "apocalypse" of Shem may be an abbreviated reference to the Manichaean "Living Spirit," an alternate designation for the anonymous revealing angel who seems to figure in the other portions of this "apocalypse." The language employed of this entity here is reminiscent of Acts 8:39, where "the spirit of the Lord" suddenly removes the apostle Philip from the company of the Ethiopian official (*πνεῦμα κυρίου ἥρπασεν τὸν Φίλιππον*). For further discussion of the Living Spirit and its role in the narrative, see our discussion of the relevant lemma in Chapter Six.

πάλιν εἶ[πεν ὅτι ὁ ἄγγε]λος κα[..... ....] δε[..... ....] τ[..... "Moreover [he says that 'the an]gel ....'" The final few lines of this page are heavily damaged, but the initial words suggest that this is a redactional seam. Greek πάλιν presumably renders Syriac ܬܘܒ "again, once more."

The modern editors offer some tentative suggestions for restoring the phrase ὁ ἄγγε]λος κα[ ], reading perhaps κα[ταπτὰς] "the angel *flew*" (cf. *CMC* 17.11), κα[τελθὼν] "the angel *descended*" (cf. *CMC* 58.23), or κα[ταβὰς] "the angel *came down*" (cf. John 18:1).[46] Each is a plausible rendering in the present context.

καὶ ἀπή]ν[εγκέ με εἰς κλίμα τὸ ἀρ]κτῷον καὶ ἐθεώρησα ἐκεῖσε ὄρη ὑπερμεγέθη καὶ ἀγγέλους καὶ τόπους πολλούς "[and brought me to the] nort[hern region] where I beheld immense mountains and angels and many places." The direction "north" possesses a positive connotation in Manichaean cosmological texts, where it is almost certainly inherited from an analogous evaluation found in Second Temple Jewish pseudepigraphic texts, and which in turn preserve this assessment from early West Semitic religiosity.[47] "North" is one of the spatial parameters used by Manichaeans to describe the location of the Realm of Light, or alternatively, the celestial Tree of Life. Such language emerges, for example, in the fragments of an unidentified Manichaean composition which are quoted within a sixth-century homily of the Monophysite patriarch Severus of Antioch. Therein we read:

> They (i.e., the Manichaeans) say: 'That which is Good, also named Light and the Tree of Life, possesses those regions which lie to the east, west, and north ... Its (the Tree of Life's) land encompasses three regions: that of the north which extends both beyond and below, and that of the east and west (also) extending both beyond and below.'[48]

By contrast, the Manichaean Realm of Darkness (the Tree of Death) "exists eternally in the region of the south, having its own locality which it is over."[49]

This Manichaean connection between the "Tree of Life" (i.e., the Realm of Light) and its northern provenance appears to be textually linked to *1 Enoch* 25:5, whose Ethiopic version states: "From its fruit (i.e., of the Tree of Life) life will be given to the elect, and *toward the north* it will be planted, in a sacred place by the abode of the Lord, the Eternal King." The

corresponding Greek text is apparently corrupt here, reading "food" (εἰς βορᾶν) in place of "north" (εἰς βορρᾶν);[50] unfortunately the Aramaic *Urtext* does not survive for this passage. That "north" may indeed be the correct reading in this text is indicated not only by Manichaean cosmological principles, but also by passages like *1 Enoch* 34:1; 61:1-5; 70:2-3; 77:7; and *Orig. World* 110.8-10.

Mandaean cosmology also situates its World of Light (*alma ḏnhura*) in the "north." According to the *Ginzā*, the Lord of Greatness, another designation for Mandā de-Ḥayyē, "is enthroned in the far north" (*Right Ginzā* 7.3-4 [ed. Lidzbarski]). A discussion now extant in the twelfth book of the same work labels "north" as a place of "brightness" and "living water" where the baleful "planets and signs" are powerless; whereas the "south" is the location of the "worlds of darkness" and "black water."[51] Confirmation of this spatial orientation and evaluation among the Mandaeans occurs in Muslim sources. According to the eleventh-century savant al-Bīrūnī, the group whom he terms the "real Ṣābians,"[52] who are in fact the Mandaeans,

> are the remnant of the Jewish tribes who remained in Babylonia, when the other tribes left it for Jerusalem in the days of Cyrus and Artaxerxes. Those remaining tribes felt themselves attracted to the rites of the Magians, and so they *inclined* (were *inclined*, i.e. Ṣâbî) towards the religion of Nebukadnezzar, and adopted a system mixed up of Magism and Judaism like that of the Samaritans in Syria. The greatest number of them are settled at Wâsiṭ, in Sawâd-al'irâḳ[53] ... *they pretend to be the descendents of Enos the son of Seth* [my emphasis]. They differ from the Ḥarrânians ... In praying, even, *they turn towards the north pole* [my emphasis], whilst the Ḥarrânians turn towards the south pole.[54]

Interestingly, the author of the *Fihrist* relates on the authority of al-Kindī[55] that the Ḥarrānian Ṣābians "have adopted one direction for prayer, which they have fixed towards the North Star in its course."[56] Other Muslim sources also remark the Ḥarrānian esteem for the "north,"[57] but this association may be due to rife confusion regarding the distinctions between "true" and "pseudo-Ṣābians."

It is nevertheless evident that certain Syro-Mesopotamian religious communities adhere to a particular pattern of directional assessment that views "north" favorably and "south" unfavorably.[58] The Enosh fragment seems to belong within this same interpretive trajectory, since it is that quarter to which Enosh is taken for his audience with the emissary from the "Pre-Eminent Almighty One."

διελάλησεν δέ μοι καὶ εἶπεν· ὁ ἰσχυρότατος τὴν ὑπεροχὴν ἀπέστειλέ με πρὸς σέ, ἵνα σοι ἀποκαλύψω τὰ ἀπόρρητα ἃ ἐνεθυμήθης, ἐπειδήπερ ἐξελέγης εἰς τὴν ἀλήθειαν "He spoke to me and said: 'The Pre-Eminent Almighty One has sent me to you so that I might reveal to you the secret (things) which you contemplated, since indeed you have chosen truth.'" While the messenger might possibly be identified with the Living Spirit (see above, as well as the discussion in Chapter Six below), a well-known Manichaean deity, the entity who has commissioned him bears the designation "the Pre-eminent Almighty One" (ὁ ἰσχυρότατος τὴν ὑπεροχήν). The superlative language favors a possible

identification with the Manichaean Father of Greatness (אבא רבתא) or the Mandaean Lord of Greatness (*mara d̲rabuta*),[59] the supreme ruler of the Realm of Light for each of these gnostic traditions. However, the particular epithet employed in the present Enosh fragment occurs nowhere else in the extant literature. L. Koenen has suggested that the phrase "pre-eminent almighty one" encodes a reference to "Jesus the Splendor,"[60] the divine emissary who rouses Adam from "the sleep of death" after the latter's fabrication by the archons, but this identification seems unlikely in view of that entity's inferior station *vis-à-vis* the Living Spirit in the Manichaean hierarchy of supernal deities.[61]

The "secret (things)" (τὰ ἀπόρρητα) contemplated by Enosh are the mysteries of creation (מעשה בראשית) which puzzled him at the commencement of his "apocalypse," a ruminatory process which apparently set into motion the revelatory events recounted in the present narrative. The demonstrable efficacy of this type of mystical meditation in terms of its stimulative provocation of an "ascent-experience" underscores the seriousness of the Tannaitic warnings about indulging this species of study and exposition.

ταῦτα δὲ πάντα τὰ ἀπόκρυφα γράψον ἐπὶ πτύχας χαλκᾶς καὶ ἀπόθου ἐν τῇ γῇ τῆς ἐρήμου "Write down all these hidden things upon bronze tablets and deposit (them) in the wilderness." It will be recalled that a similar command is given to Adam by the angel Balsamos, although there the means of preservation involved the use of "exceedingly clean papyrus which is unspoiled and which has not harbored worms" (*CMC* 49.5-10). Here "bronze tablets" are enjoined, which should furthermore be archived "in the wilderness" (ἐν τῇ γῇ τῆς ἐρήμου), a periphrastic phrase that literally echoes the initial setting of Enosh's numinous experience. One is immediately reminded of the curious "Copper Scroll" (3Q*15*) recovered from a cave in the wilderness of Qumran.[62] Like Enosh's "tablets," the Copper Scroll also purportedly provides a written tabulation of "hidden things," although in this latter case the items featured are the locations of caches of precious metals and spices. Despite persistent exhumation efforts, archaeologists have so far failed to uncover any trace of these treasures, a circumstance suggesting that the document is more folkloric than factual.

The use of bronze or copper as a writing material for archival purposes, along with its subsequent deposit in the wilderness, is hence not without parallel in Jewish literary history. The choice of this metal as a medium of preservation would seem to be based upon its durability (as opposed to perishable materials like parchment, papyrus, or leather), an important factor to consider given the valuable nature of the information that is inscribed thereon. This same concern with preservation apparently governs an intriguing correspondence with the Qumran Copper Scroll which is found in the medieval Jewish tractate entitled *Massekhet Kelim*.[63] This composition allegedly describes the protective concealing of the Temple vessels at the time of Nebuchadnezzar's conquest of Jerusalem. Therein it states that "Shimmur the Levite and his associates listed *on a copper tablet* the sacred

vessels and the vessels of the Temple which were in Jerusalem and in every place."[64] Presumably this inventory would survive "until the advent of a legitimate king for Israel" (עד שיקום מלך צדק לישראל), when the hidden vessels will be miraculously restored to the reconstituted nation.

Apart from the aforementioned instances, the use of "bronze tablets" as a source of revelatory information appears in the pseudo-Platonic dialogue *Axiochus*, a work of Hellenistic provenance. Therein Socrates claims that his knowledge about the afterlife is due to his tutelage under a Persian magus named Gobryas, whose knowledge in turn derives ultimately from information inscribed upon two "bronze tablets" allegedly brought to Delos by Apollo and Artemis from the Hyperboreans.[65]

πάντα δὲ ἃ γράφεις προδηλότα[τα γρά]ψον. ἑτοίμως γὰρ [ἔχει ἡ ἀποκάλ]υψις αὕ[τη ἡ ἐμή, ἣ οὐ] τελευτᾷ [εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα, ἀπο]καλυ[φθῆναι τοῖς ἀδελ]φοῖς [..... ....]ς πᾶ[σι "'Everything which you write recor[d most p]lainly (carefully?). For [my] revela[tion, which shall not] pass away, is ready [to be] reve[aled to] al[l the breth]ren ....'" Emphasis is once again laid upon the importance of a *written* testimony in the dissemination of religious instruction, an interest that accords with the demonstrable Manichaean esteem for an authentic, preferably autobiographical, documentation of the teachings promulgated by the heralds of the Realm of Light. The recurrence of this feature in the "apocalypse" of Enosh underscores this fragment's probable Manichaean origin.

The phrase apparently expressing the permanent veracity of the teachings ("for [my] revela[tion, which shall not] pass away ..."), although largely reconstructed by the modern editors, is a plausible rendering. One of the canonical scriptures reportedly authored by Mani, the *Shābuhragān*,[66] is heavily dependent upon the so-called "little apocalypse" of the synoptic gospel tradition, and the present clause, if accurately rendered, may be a periphrastic rendering of Matt 24:35b//Mark13:31b//Luke 21:33b, probably derived from the *Diatessaron*.

πολλὰ δὲ καὶ ἄλλα ὑ]πάρχει τούτοις ἐοικότα ἐν ταῖς γραφαῖς αὐτοῦ ὑποδεικνύοντα περὶ τῆς αὐτοῦ ἁρπαγῆς καὶ ἀποκαλύψεως. πάντα γὰρ ἃ ἤκουσεν καὶ εἶδεν γράψας κατέλειψεν τοῖς μεταγενεστέροις "[Many other] things similar to these are in his writings (which) set forth his ascension and revelation, for everything that he heard and saw he recorded (and) left behind for the subsequent generations ...." This is a redactional note supplied by the compiler of this section of the *Codex*, presumably Baraies, which justifies the inclusion of the Enosh excerpts within the catena of testimonies. Similar appendices conclude each of the apocalyptic fragments featured in this portion of the *Codex*, and identical sentiments are expressed in the introductory and concluding remarks to the catena itself.[67]

πᾶσι τοῦ τῆς ἀληθείας πνεύματος "all those belonging to the spirit of truth." This qualification suggests that the message proclaimed by Enosh (and by extension his fellow "heralds") would be appreciated by only a select group

of hearers; namely, those "belonging to the spirit of truth." This particular expression points chronologically forward to the emergence of the Manichaean religious community. The phrase "spirit of truth" is an unambiguous reference to the Johannine Paraclete,[68] whose true identity, according to Manichaean interpretation, is Mani himself.[69] This final clause thus underscores the solidarity perceived to exist between the revelatory experiences and teachings of the biblical forefathers and those subsequently enjoyed and promulgated by Mani.

Summary

Close analysis of the "apocalypse" of Enosh indicates that these fragments share a number of motifs with the other allegedly Jewish "apocalypses" featured within the *Codex*, especially that of Shem, the composition which immediately follows the Enosh material in the *Codex*. Neither Enosh nor Shem receive extensive narrative development within later Jewish or Christian literary lore, at least within works associated with the classical formulations of those religions. It is only within Mandaeism, a Syro-Mesopotamian gnostic community of uncertain origin, that the figure of Enosh enjoys esteem as an author of revelatory literature and eventually as an emissary of the supernal Realm of Light. Our analysis has shown that there are some significant correspondences between material that is found in the *CMC* "apocalypse" of Enosh and the Mandaean *Ginzā*, a relationship which possesses suggestive implications for the age and provenance of Mandaean literary activity. There are, moreover, some indications within the "apocalypse" that point to a Manichaean adaptation and/or redaction of its discourse. These features collectively create a suspicion that the "apocalypse" of Enosh, at least in its extant form, is not an authentic remnant of Second Temple era Jewish pseudepigraphic expression, but instead an artificial composition constructed to enhance the status of this forefather *vis-à-vis* his more illustrious colleagues.

NOTES

[1]*CMC* 52.8-55.9. Text cited from L. Koenen and C. Römer, *Der Kölner Mani-Kodex ... Kritische Edition* (Opladen: Westdeutscher Verlag, 1988) 34-36.

[2]Although note *2 Enoch* 33:10 (long version), which ascribes written works to each of Enoch's ancestors. The parallel passage within the "short version" mentions only Adam and Seth.

[3]See the discussion of Gen 4:26 in Chapter Two, and in general, S.D. Fraade, *Enosh and His Generation: Pre-Israelite Hero and History in Postbiblical Interpretation* (Chico, CA: Scholars Press, 1984). Note too *3 Enoch* (Ms. Vat. 228; §§7-8 [ed. Schäfer]): והכל מסתכלין בזיו דמות שכינתו ואין ניזוקין עד שבאו בני דורו של אנוש לעולם שהיה ראש לכל עובדי ע"ז שבעולם "and everyone beheld the glory of the image of His Shekinah and no one was corrupt until the advent of the generation of Enosh in the world, for he was the originator of all those who worship idols in the world."

[4]Moses Khorenats'i, *History of the Armenians* (ed. R.W. Thomson; Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press) 71.

[5]See Chapter Two, n.48.

[6]Note that the immediately preceding discussion of the accomplishments of Seth lists "knowledge of letters" (ܕܝܕܥܬ ܐܬܘܬ) as the significant cultural achievement of his era, but neglects to inform us just what was composed using these characters.

[7]See R. Reitzenstein, *Das mandäische Buch des Herrn der Grösse und die Evangelienüberlieferung* (Heidelberg: C. Winter, 1919); R. Reitzenstein and H.H. Schaeder, *Studien zum antike Synkretismus aus Iran und Griechenland* (Leipzig: B.G. Teubner, 1926) 306-41.

[8]An excellent overview, with bibliography, is supplied by F. Rosenthal, *Die aramäistische Forschung seit Th. Nöldeke's Veröffentlichungen* (reprinted, Leiden: Brill, 1964) 250-51.

[9]*Right Ginzā* 251.12-14 (ed. Lidzbarski): *raza usidra danuš rba br šitil rba br adam rba br 'utria rurbia d'qara.* Text cited from the transcription of K. Rudolph, *Theogonie, Kosmogonie und Anthropogonie in den mandäischen Schriften* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1965) 303.

[10]Rudolph, *Theogonie* 303. Compare the frequent employment of the phrase "great Seth" in *Gos. Eg.* 51.20; 54.11; 55.17; 56.13-14; 59.15; 60.1, 8, 9, 14, 15; 61.16, 23; 62.19, 24; 63.11; 64.2, 24; 65.17, 20; 68.2, 10; *Treat. Seth* 70.12; and note the remarks of B.A. Pearson, "The Figure of Seth in Gnostic Literature," in idem, *Gnosticism, Judaism, and Egyptian Christianity* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1990) 63.

[11]Compare *Right Ginzā* 27.19-28.7; 45.22-46.6 (ed. Lidzbarski). A tri-fold cataclysmic scheme is also featured in the Coptic *Apocalypse of Adam.* One wonders whether this particular structural skeleton is ultimately indebted to a similar motif found in the Old Babylonian myth of *Atrahasis.*

[12]Interestingly rabbinic tradition also speaks of a deluge during the time of Enosh. See *Mek., Bahodeš* 6 (ed. Horovitz-Rabin 223.13-14): באותה שעה עלה אוקיאנוס והציף שלישו של

עולם ; also *Sifre Deut* §43 (ed. Finkelstein 97.2-3); Tanḥuma, *Noaḥ* §18; Rashi *ad* Amos 5:8. The notion that there were two Floods—the first during the era of Enosh and the second during the time of Noah—is exegetically derived from the duplication of Amos 5:8b in Amos 9:6b, wherein both places we read: השקוראלמי הים וישפכם על פני הארץ ; note *Gen. Rab.* 23.7 (Theodor-Albeck 1.228): שני פעמים כתי השקוראלמי הים כנגד כי פעמים שעלה הים והציף את העולם ; see also 5.5 (ibid. 1.35). For further references, consult L. Ginzberg, *The Legends of the Jews* (7 vols.; Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society, 1909-38) 5.152.

[13]The similarity of this narrative sequence with the one recounting the career of Enoch in *1 Enoch* 6-16 is probably not accidental.

[14]*Right Ginzā* 269.4-6 (ed. Lidzbarski).

[15]See especially S. Talmon, "The 'Desert Motif' in the Bible and in Qumran Literature," *Biblical Motifs: Origins and Transformations* (ed. A. Altmann; Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1966) 31-63.

[16]*À la* Elijah in 1 Kgs 19? Interestingly, 1 Kgs 18:1 also features an analogous truncated chronological note: ... ויהי ימים רבים וברבר יי היה אל אליהו בשנה השלישית לאמר "And after many days, the word of the Lord came to Elijah *in the third year* ..."; can this portion of the Elijah-saga be the textual paradigm for the Enosh fragment's setting?

[17]*Zost.* 3.23-28. Translation taken from *The Nag Hammadi Library in English* (3d ed.; ed. J.M. Robinson; San Francisco: Harper & Row, 1988) 404.

[18]*CMC* 55.13-16. Henrichs-Koenen clearly base their restorations on this passage; see *ZPE* 19 (1975) 81.

[19]*Herm. Vis.* 1.1.3: μετὰ χρόνον τινα πορευομένου μου εἰς Κώμας καὶ δοξάζοντος τὰς κτίσεις τοῦ θεοῦ, ὡς μεγάλαι καὶ ἐκπρεπεῖς καὶ δυναταί εἰσιν. Text and translation cited from *The Apostolic Fathers, Volume II* (LCL 25; reprinted, Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1992) 6-7.

[20]*C.H.* I.1: Ἐννοίας μοί ποτε γενομένης περὶ τῶν ὄντων ...; *C.H.* I.3: Μαθεῖν θέλω τὰ ὄντα καὶ νοῆσαι τὴν τούτων φύσιν καὶ γνῶναι τὸν θεόν. Text cited from the edition included in Reitzenstein-Schaeder, *Studien zum antiken Synkretismus* 154-55; translation is that of B. Layton, *The Gnostic Scriptures* (Garden City, NY: Doubleday & Company, 1987) 452.

[21]B. Visotzky, "Rabbinic Randglossen to the Cologne Mani Codex," *ZPE* 52 (1983) 298.

[22]For discussion, see G. Scholem, *Major Trends in Jewish Mysticism* (3d ed.; reprinted, New York: Schocken, 1978) 73-78; idem, *Kabbalah* (Jerusalem: Keter, 1974) 14-35. A recent monograph-length treatment is N. Séd, *La mystique cosmologique juive* (Paris: Éditions de l'École des Hautes Études en Sciences Sociales, 1981).

[23]*Right Ginzā* 262.1-7 (ed. Lidzbarski).

[24]Koenen-Römer, *Kritische Edition* 34. The earlier *ZPE* edition of Henrichs and Koenen does not attempt to restore this passage.

[25]*Left Ginzā* 424.22-429.23 (ed. Lidzbarski). See the discussion in Chapter Four above.

[26]Termed simply "Death" (ὁ θάνατος) by the two recensions of the *Testament of Abraham.*

[27]Notably in the second appendix to recension A of the *'Abot de Rabbi Nathan* which was published by S. Schechter in his edition of this work; see *Massekhet 'Abot de-Rabbi Natan* (ed. S. Schechter; Wien: C.D. Lippe, 1887) 78b.

[28]*Bet ha-Midrasch* (= *BHM*) (6 vols.; ed. A. Jellinek; reprinted, Jerusalem: Bamberger & Wahrmann, 1938) 2.48-51.

[29]*CMC* 57.4-11: καὶ τότε ἠλλοιώθη ὁ χαρακτὴρ τοῦ προσώπου μου ὥστε καταπεσεῖν ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς. καὶ οἱ μὲν σφόνδυλοι τοῦ νώτου μου διεκλονήθησαν, οἱ δὲ πόδες μου οὐκ ἔστησαν ἐπὶ τοὺς ἀστραγάλους. Compare the reaction of Enoch in 59.1-3: [ἰδὼν δὲ] αὐτοὺς ἐκινήθην ὑπὸ δέους ὥστε τὰ γόνατά μου ἀλλήλοις προσαράσσειν "[Upon seeing] them I was so moved by fear that my knees began knocking."

[30]The phrase "disposition of the recipient" was coined by J.J. Collins for use in his valuable analysis of the primary motifs found in apocalyptic literature; see his "Introduction: Toward the Morphology of a Genre," *Semeia* 14 (1979) 1-19.

[31]I. Gruenwald, "Manichaeism and Judaism in Light of the Cologne Mani Codex," *ZPE* 50 (1983) 44.

[32]*Right Ginzā* 262.27-30 (ed. Lidzbarski).

[33]I.e., *anuš zuṭa.* This epithet is used of the human Enosh, prior to his apotheosis. See the discussion above.

[34]*Right Ginzā* 264.15-18 (ed. Lidzbarski).

[35]The actual identity of the "spirit" emerges from the remarkably parallel "apocalypse" of Shem that immediately succeeds the Enosh fragment in the *Codex.* There we read π[ν(εῦμ)α τὸ] ζῶν "[the] *Living* S[pirit]" (*CMC* 55.17-18), a well-attested designation for one of the important Manichaean cosmogonic entities. See our discussion below.

[36]The *Hodayot* seer is however raised לרום עולם (1QH 3:20) prior to his perambulation on "the plain"; compare 1QSb 5:23 and the remarks of M. Delcor, *Les hymnes de Qumran (Hodayot)* (Paris: Letouzey et Ané, 1962) 125. Unless otherwise noted, all textual citations from the Qumran *Hodayot* are taken from Delcor's edition, which is in turn dependent upon the *editio princeps* of E.L. Sukenik.

[37]F.T. Fallon, "The Gnostic Apocalypses," *Semeia* 14 (1979) 125.

[38]See *Soph. Jes. Chr.* 90.14-91.13; *1 Apoc. Jas.* 30.18-42.19; *Ep. Pet. Phil.* 133.13-138.7; *Pistis Sophia* 1-3; 4.141. It is possible that the vision of Jesus experienced by John which comprises the contents of the *Apocryphon of John* takes place upon the Mount of Olives; note *Ap. John* 1.17-19 and the remarks by Layton, *Gnostic Scriptures* 28.

[39]*CMC* 55.15-56.3: ἐμοῦ δὲ διαλογιζομένου ἐξα[ί]φνης ἥρπ[ασέν] με π[ν(εῦμ)α τὸ] ζῶν καὶ ἀν[ήνεγκεν βί]ᾳ μεγίστῃ [καὶ κατέ]στησεν κα[τὰ τὸ ἄκρον] ὄρους ὑψη[λοτάτου καὶ] εἶπ[εν π]ρὸς [ἐμέ οὕτω] λέ[γων· ....] δόξαν δὸς τῷ μεγίστῳ τῆς τιμῆς βασιλεῖ.

[40]Translation is that of M.A. Knibb, "1 Enoch," *AOT* (Sparks) 206. The Greek version of *1 Enoch* 17:2 reads: καὶ ἀπήγαγόν με εἰς ζοφώδη τόπον καὶ εἰς ὄρος οὗ ἡ κεφαλὴ ἀφικνεῖτο εἰς τὸν οὐρανόν, where suggestive echoes can be discerned. Unless otherwise indicated, the Greek text(s) of *1 Enoch* derive from *Apocalypsis Henochi Graece* (PVTG 3; ed. M. Black; Leiden: Brill, 1970).

[41]The Qumran fragments were first published by J.T. Milik, "Le Testament de Lévi en araméen," *RB* 62 (1955) 398-406 and planche IV. See also idem, *The Books of Enoch: Aramaic Fragments of Qumrân Cave 4* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1976) 23-24; DJD I 87-91 and plate 17; J.A. Fitzmyer and D.J. Harrington, *A Manual of Palestinian Aramaic Texts* (Rome: Biblical Institute Press, 1978) 80-91, 202-204. For the Genizah fragments, see H.L. Pass and J. Arendzen, "Fragment of an Aramaic Text of the Testament of

Levi," *JQR* o.s. 12 (1899-1900) 651-61; R.H. Charles and A. Cowley, "An Early Source of the Testaments of the Patriarchs," *JQR* o.s. 19 (1906-07) 566-83; R.H. Charles, *The Greek Versions of the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1908) 245-56; J.C. Greenfield and M.E. Stone, "Remarks on the Aramaic Testament of Levi from the Geniza," *RB* 86 (1979) 214-30. A useful "eclectic" edition was constructed by K. Beyer, *Die aramäischen Texte vom Toten Meer* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1984) 188-209.

[42]4QTLevi[a] (=4Q*213*) ii lines 15-18, first published by Milik, *RB* 62 (1955) 400. See also the renderings of Fitzmyer-Harrington, *Manual* 90; Beyer, *Texte* 194; M.E. Stone and J.C. Greenfield, "The Prayer of Levi," *JBL* 112 (1993) 256.

[43]Manuscripts display some divergence over what is contained at this crucial juncture of the text. The critical edition incorporates a phrase which identifies the mountain seen as "Aspis" (cf. *T. Levi* 6:1), but four other manuscripts do not contain this phrase, stating instead καὶ ἤμην ἐν αὐτῷ "and I was on it" (i.e., the mountain). *Aramaic Levi* likewise preserves no trace of the name of the mountain.

[44]Text of the *Testament of Levi* is cited from the critical edition of M. de Jonge, *The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs: A Critical Edition of the Greek Text* (PVTG 1.2; Leiden: Brill, 1978) 25-26.

[45]The translation "wind" would seem to be ruled out by the scribal use of a *nominum sacrum*.

[46]Koenen-Römer, *Kritische Edition* 34.

[47]Note especially Isa 14:13; Ps 48:3; and the references adduced by M. Lidzbarski in his edition of the *Ginzā* (p. 7 n.1); F.M. Cross, *Canaanite Myth and Hebrew Epic: Essays in the History of the Religion of Israel* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1973) 36-39. See also the valuable study of E. Lipiński, "El's Abode: Mythological Traditions Related to Mount Hermon and to the Mountains of Armenia," OLP 2 (1971) 13-69. Interestingly, "north" does not possess this positive value in either Iranian or later Jewish traditions. Rather, for both of these latter circles, "north" becomes the locale associated with demons and evil spirits. See J.C. Reeves, *Jewish Lore in Manichaean Cosmogony: Studies in the Book of Giants Traditions* (Cincinnati: Hebrew Union College Press, 1992) 177-78 n.24 for an extensive list of examples.

[48]M. Brière, "Les Homiliae Cathedrales de Sévère d'Antioche, traduction syriaque de Jacques d'Édesse CXX à CXXV," *PO* 29 (1960) 152.14-15; 154.11-13: ... . Translation taken from Reeves, *Jewish Lore* 167-68. Compare the so-called *Chronicon Maroniticum*: ... "Mani says in his teaching that there were two original beings: God and Hyle. The first was good and possessed the east, north, west, and upper regions ...." Text cited from *Chronica Minora* (CSCO scrip. syri, ser. III, t. 4; ed. I. Guidi; Paris: Reipublicae, 1903) 60.9-12. So too al-Shahrastānī, *Milal*: جهته جهة فوق وأكثرهم على أنه مرتفع من ناحية الشمال "Domain (of the Realm of Light): the region above, and the majority regard it as elevated above to the north." Text cited from al-Shahrastānī, *Kitāb al-milal wa-al-niḥal* (2 vols.; ed. M.S. Kilani; Beirut: Dar el-Marefah, n.d.) 1.245.

[49]Brière, *PO* 29 (1960) 156.7-8: . Translation taken from Reeves, *Jewish Lore* 168. Compare *Chronicon Maroniticum* (ed. Guidi) 60.12-13: ... "... and the other being which was evil possessed the southern regions"; al-Shahrastānī, *Milal* (ed. Kilani) 1.245: جهتها جهة تحت وأكثرهم على أنها منحطة من ناحية الجنوب "Domain (of the Realm of Darkness): the region below, and the majority regard it as fallen below to the south."

[50]Scholars typically argue the opposite point of view; namely, that the Greek version preserves the correct reading of this passage. See R.H. Charles, *The Ethiopic Version of the Book of Enoch* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1906) 63; idem, *The Book of Enoch or 1 Enoch* (2d ed.; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1912) 53; idem, *APOT* 2.205; M. Black, *The Book of Enoch or I Enoch* (SVTP 7; Leiden: Brill, 1985) 171; J.C. VanderKam, *Enoch: A Man for All Generations* (Columbia, SC: University of South Carolina Press, 1995) 57.

[51]*Right Ginzā* 280.25-282.13 [ed. Lidzbarski]. Compare the similar language contained in the Manichaean fragments which were cited by Severus of Antioch. Note also the description of Mani's vision of world inundation contained in *CMC* 77.13-79.12, as well as *2 Apoc. Bar.* 53. For speculation regarding why the southern quarter came to have such an association, see Reeves, *Jewish Lore* 179 n.27.

[52]There is much confusion in Muslim (and hence modern Western) sources regarding the application of the Qur'anic appellation "Ṣābian." Regardless of whom the Qur'an (2:62; 5:69; 22:17) intended to designate by this label, later Muslim works use it to refer to (1) a religious group or identity contemporary with Muhammad, (2) adherents of the surviving vestiges of pagan religiosity centered around the city of Ḥarran, and (3) the Mandaeans of southern Iraq. The scholarly literature focusing on this issue is immense: see especially D. Chwolsohn, *Die Ssabier und der Ssabismus* (2 vols.; St. Petersburg: Kaiserlichen Akademie der Wissenschaften, 1856); J. Wellhausen, *Reste arabischen Heidentums* (3d ed.; Berlin, 1927; reprinted, Berlin: W. de Gruyter, 1961) 234-42; M. Gil, "The Creed of Abū 'Āmir," *IOS* 12 (1992) 9-57.

[53]This locale accords with that given by Ibn al-Nadīm for the sect termed Mughtasilah ("baptists"), allegedly founded by al-Ḥasīḥ (Elchasai!). See G. Flügel, *Mani: seine Lehre und seine Schriften* (Leipzig, 1862; reprinted, Osnabrück: Biblio Verlag, 1969) 133-35.

[54]al-Bīrūnī, *al-Āthar al-bāqiya 'an-il-qurūn al-khāliya* (*Chronologie orientalischer Völker von Albêrûnî* [ed. C.E. Sachau; reprinted, Leipzig: Otto Harrassowitz, 1923] 188.10-15): هم الذين تخلفوا ببابل من جملة الأسباط الناهضة فى أيام كورش وايام ارطحشست الى بيت المقدس ومالوا الى شرائيع المجوس فصيروا الى دين يختصر فذهبوا مذهبا ممتزجا من المجوسية واليهودية كالسامرة بالشام وقد يوجد أكثرهم بواسط وسواد العراق ... منتمين الى انوس بن شيث ومخالفين الحرانية ... حتى انهم يتوجهون فى الصلوة الى جهة القطب الشمالى والحرانية الى الجنوبى . Translation taken from C.E. Sachau, *The Chronology of Ancient Nations* (London: William H. Allen and Co., 1879) 188; see also 314. Later in the same work al-Bīrūnī states: "I believe that the Manichaeans, too, turn towards the north pole, because this is, according to them, the middle of the dome of heaven and its highest place. I find, however, that the author of the *Book on Marriage*, who is a Manichaean and one of their missionaries, reproaches the people of the three religions with turning to one direction to the exclusion of another. With this he reproaches them, besides other things, and he seems to indicate that a man who prays to God does not need any Kibla at all" (*Chronology* 329).

[55]I.e., Abū Yūsuf Ya'qūb ibn Isḥāq al-Kindī, the renowned ninth-century philosopher from Kūfah. See J. Jolivet and R. Rashed, "Al-Kindī, Abū Yūsuf Ya'ḳūb b. Isḥāḳ," *EI*[2] 5.122-23. The work from which al-Nadīm extracts this exposition of the religion of the Ḥarranians may have been al-Kindī's *Kitāb risālati-hi fī iftirāq al-milal fī l-tawḥīd*; see G. Monnot, "Sabéens et idolâtres selon 'Abd al-Jabbār," *Islam et religions* (Paris: Éditions Maisonneuve et Larose, 1986) 221 n.6.

[56]B. Dodge, *The Fihrist of al-Nadīm: A Tenth-Century Survey of Muslim Culture* (2 vols.; New York: Columbia University Press, 1970) 2.746. Contrast al-Bīrūnī: "The Harranians turn in praying towards the south pole ..." (*Chronology* 329).

[57]See D.S. Margoliouth, "Ḥarranians," *ERE* 6.519-20.

[58]For further discussion and references, see A.J.H.W. Brandt, *Die mandäische Religion* (Leipzig, 1889; reprinted, Amsterdam: Philo Press, 1973) 69-71; E. Peterson, "Urchristentum und Mandäismus," *ZNW* 27 (1928) 94-95; I. Scheftelowitz, *Die Entstehung der manichäischen Religion und des Erlösungsmysteriums* (Giessen: A. Töpelmann, 1922) 16; K. Rudolph, *Die Mandäer* (2 vols.; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1960-61) 1.126 n.4, 136-37 n.4, 179 n.2.

[59]For discussion of these designations, see especially Rudolph, *Theogonie* 82-83 n.3; G. Scholem, *Jewish Gnosticism, Merkabah Mysticism, and Talmudic Tradition* (2d ed.; New York: The Jewish Theological Seminary of America, 1965) 67 n.8; Reeves, *Jewish Lore* 200 n.15; and Chapter Four, n.58 above.

[60]L. Koenen, "Augustine and Manichaeism in Light of the Cologne Mani Codex," *Illinois Classical Studies* 3 (1978) 171 n.67.

[61]For a convenient summary of these relationships, see M. Tardieu, *Le manichéisme* (Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 1981) 103-107; note also the discussion of "Jesus the Splendor" by P. Van Lindt, *The Names of Manichaean Mythological Figures: A Comparative Study on Terminology in the Coptic Sources* (Wiesbaden: O. Harrassowitz, 1992) 133-48.

[62]J.T. Milik, "Le rouleau de cuivre provenant de la grotte 3Q (3Q15)," DJD III.1 211-302, 314-17. For further extended discussion, see also A. Dupont-Sommer, *The Essene Writings from Qumran* (reprinted, Gloucester, MA: Peter Smith, 1973) 379-93; N. Golb, *Who Wrote the Dead Sea Scrolls? The Search for the Secret of Qumran* (New York: Scribner, 1995) 117-30.

[63]*BHM* 2.88-91. Credit for recognizing this parallel belongs to J.T. Milik; see his "Notes d'épigraphie et de topographie palestiniennes. 8. Traité des vases (מסכת כלים)," *RB* 66 (1959) 567-75.

[64]*BHM* 2.88: כלי הקורש וכלי ביח המקרש שהיו בירושלים ובכל מקום כתבום שימור הלוי וחביריו <u>על</u> <u>לוח נחושת</u> ... . See also T.H. Gaster, *The Dead Sea Scriptures* (3d ed.; Garden City, NY: Anchor Books, 1976) 534-35.

[65]A.-J. Festugière, *La révélation d'Hermès Trismégiste, I: L'astrologie et les sciences occultes* (2d ed.; reprinted, Paris: Société d'Édition Les Belles Lettres, 1983) 319; see also A.E. Taylor, *Plato: The Man and his Work* (7th ed.; reprinted, London: Methuen & Co. Ltd., 1977) 550-52; M. Hengel, *Judaism and Hellenism* (2d ed.; 2 vols.; Philadelphia: Fortress, 1974) 1.211; H.W. Attridge, "Greek and Latin Apocalypses," *Semeia* 14 (1979) 167, 184.

[66]See Chapter One, n.42 above.

[67]See *CMC* 47.1-49.15; 71.6-72.7.

[68]John 14:16-17; see also 15:26; 16:7-14. Interestingly, the phrase "spirit of truth" (רוח אמת) figures within Qumran literature, where it usually seems to function as a by-name

of the "Prince of Light" who exercises sovereignty over all the "sons of Light." See 1QS 3:18; 4:21; 4:23; cf. 1QM 13:10. Compare also *Hyp. Arch.* 97(145).1-3; *T. Judah* 20:1-5.

[69]See *CMC* 63.16-23; 70.10-23; *Kephalaia* 14.4-6; and especially Chapter One, nn.45-47 above.

CHAPTER SIX

THE APOCALYPSE OF SHEM

Text

ὁμοίως δὲ καὶ ὁ Σῆμ τοῦτον τὸν τρόπον ἔφη ἐν τῇ ἀποκαλύψει αὐτοῦ· ἐλογιζόμην περὶ πάντων τῶν ἔργων ποίῳ τρόπῳ ἐγένοντο. ἐμοῦ δὲ διαλογιζομένου ἐξα[ί]φνης ἥρπ[ασέν] με π[ν(εῦμ)α τὸ] ζῶν καὶ ἀν[ήνεγκεν βί]ᾳ μεγίστῃ [καὶ κατέ]στησεν κα[τὰ τὸ ἄκρον] ὄρους ὑψη[λοτάτου καὶ] εἶπ[εν π]ρὸς [ἐμέ οὕτω] λέ[γων· μὴ φοβοῦ, ἀλλὰ] δόξαν δὸς τῷ μεγίστῳ τῆς τιμῆς βασιλεῖ. καὶ πάλιν εἶπεν ὅτι σὺν ἡσυχίαι μὲν θύραι ἀνεπετάσθησαν, διῃρέθησαν δὲ καὶ νεφέλαι πρὸς τοῦ ἀνέμου. εἶδον δὲ καθεστήριον ἐπίδοξον ἀπὸ τοῦ ὕψους τοῦ ἀνωτάτου κατερχόμενον καὶ μέγιστον ἄγγελον ἐφεστῶτα αὐτοῦ. ἡ δὲ εἰκὼν τῆς ἰδέας τοῦ προσώπου αὐτοῦ πε[ρ]ικαλλὴς καὶ ὡραία ἐτύγ[χ]ανεν μᾶλλον τῆς στιλ[βούσης λα]μπηδόνος [τοῦ ἡλίο]υ, ἔτι δὲ καὶ [τῆς ἀστραπῆ]ς. παραπλη[σίως δὲ τοῖς] ἡλιακοῖς [..... .....]ε, [....]δε ἡ [στολὴ ἐν τῷ κάλλ]ει τῆς ποικιλίας στεφάνῳ πλακέντι ἐκ τῶν Φαρμουθικῶν ἀνθῶν. καὶ τότε ἠλλοιώθη ὁ χαρακτὴρ τοῦ προσώπου μου ὥστε καταπεσεῖν ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς. καὶ οἱ μὲν σφόνδυλοι τοῦ νώτου μου διεκλονήθησαν, οἱ δὲ πόδες μου οὐκ ἔστησαν ἐπὶ τοὺς ἀστραγάλους. παρέκυψεν δέ μοι φωνὴ καλοῦσα ἀπὸ τοῦ καθεστηρίου καὶ ἐπελθοῦσά μοι τῆς χειρὸς ἐλάβετο τῆς δεξιᾶς καὶ ἀνέστησεν. φυσήσασα δὲ κατ[ὰ] τῆς ὄψεώς μου ἄσθμ[α] ζωῆς προσθήκην [μοι] δυνάμεως εἰργά[σατο καὶ] δόξης. πλεῖς[τα δὲ] καὶ ἄλλα τούτ[ο]ι[ς παρα]πλ[ήσια ὑ]πάρ[χει ἐν ταῖς] αὐτοῦ γραφαῖς, καὶ τίνα ἀπεκάλυψαν αὐτῷ οἱ ἄγγελοι εἰπόντες γράψαι αὐτὰ πρὸς ὑπομνηματισμόν.[1]

Translation

Similarly also Shem spoke this way in his apocalypse: "I was thinking about the way that all things came to be. While I pondered (these things), the Living S[pirit] suddenly to[ok] me and [lift]ed me with great f[orce, and se]t (me)

on [the summit] of a lof[ty] mountain, [and] spoke [to me thusly, say]ing ['Do not be afraid; rather,] give praise to the Great King of Honor.'"

Moreover he says that "silently doors were opened and clouds were parted by the wind. I beheld a glorious throne-room descending from the heights and a mighty angel standing by it. The image of the form of his face was very beautiful and lovely, more than the brig[ht rad]iance [of the su]n, even more than [lightning]. Similarly [he radiated light like] sunlight, [and his robe ...] of diverse hues (?) like a crown plaited with May blossoms. Then the feature(s) of my face changed so that I collapsed upon the ground. The vertebrae of my back shook, and my feet could not stand upon the joints. A voice bent over me, calling from the throne-room, and having approached me took my right hand and raised (me and) blew a breath of life into my nostrils, increas[ing my] power [and] glory."

Numer[ous] other [simil]ar things are in his writings, including that which the angels revealed to him saying, "Write these things for a memoir!"

Commentary

ὁμοίως δὲ καὶ ὁ Σῆμ τοῦτον τὸν τρόπον ἔφη ἐν τῇ ἀποκαλύψει αὐτοῦ· "Similarly also Shem spoke this way in his apocalypse." Unlike Enosh, whom later classical traditions seem loath to credit with either revelatory experience or literary production, the figure of Shem, eldest son of Noah, does attract some attention from both Jewish and gnostic scribal circles. Interest in Shem stems primarily from his liminal genealogical position straddling the antediluvian and postdiluvian eras of biblically based chronography. His birth and maturation prior to the coming of the Flood allows him the opportunity to be educated in the lore of the antediluvian forefathers, and his survival of the cataclysm guarantees that the post-Flood generations will maintain access to the authentic teachings of those primeval worthies. Recognition of Shem's peculiar position and authority as a guarantor of ancient wisdom is already emphasized in the Second Temple era Jewish pseudepigraphic work known as the *Book of Jubilees*, wherein Shem inherits the literary corpus of his father (*Jub.* 10:14) and is expressly numbered among what L. Ginzberg has aptly termed a "prophetic succession" of early teachers (*Jub.* 19:24).[2] Post-biblical Jewish tradition expresses his role in this chain of transmission through the educational mission of the so-called "academy of Shem" (בית מדרשא דשם רבא),[3] a school of religious instruction which matriculates such later national heroes of piety as Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob. There is also a persistent tradition which assimilates the figure of Shem with that of Melchizedek, the enigmatic royal and priestly character who briefly appears in Genesis 14. The latter personage enjoys extensive development in post-biblical literature, a process which culminates in his close identification with, if not outright amalgamation with, types of angelic, salvific entities.[4]

Several works attributed to Shem either survive or are at least mentioned in ancient and medieval literature. Perhaps the one with the oldest pedigree

is the book that circulates under the title *Sefer Asaph ha-Rophe* (ספר אסף הרופא),[5] a medical treatise prefaced by a short historiographic recountal of the transmission of the healing arts from the era of Noah to late antiquity. Of especial interest for the present discussion are the following passages:

> This is the book of remedies that the ancient sages copied from the book of Shem, the son of Noah. It was transmitted to Noah on Mt. Lubar, one of the mountains of Ararat, after the Flood. For in those days and at that time the bastard-spirits (רוחות הממזרים)[6] began to attack the progeny of Noah, to lead them astray and to cause them to err, to injure and to afflict them with diseases and pains and with every kind of sickness that kills and destroys human beings ... then the angel (Raphael) told him (Noah) the remedies for the afflictions of humankind and all kinds of remedies for healing with trees of the earth and plants of the soil and their roots. And he sent the leaders of the remaining spirits to show Noah the medicinal trees with all their shoots, greenery, grasses, roots, and seeds, to explain to him why they were created, and to teach him all their medicinal properties for healing and for vitality. Noah wrote all these things in a book and gave it to Shem, his oldest son, and the ancient sages copied from this book and wrote many books, each one in his own language.[7]

Among the foreign sages who subsequently exploit this "book of Shem" are Asclepius (!), Hippocrates, and Galen. Ironically Shem's association with this book would seem to be expressly connected with its postdiluvian revelation to Noah. His strategic genealogical position in relation to that of his father Noah mirrors the similar status enjoyed by Seth with regard to Adam, and guarantees that the work will be faithfully transcribed and transmitted to the subsequent generations.

Jellinek had already noticed that this intriguing narrative exhibited a number of verbal and thematic connections with *1 Enoch* 15-16 and *Jub.* 10:1-14, and opined that it must be "einen hebräischen Ueberrest aus dem Buch der Jubiläen."[8] The influential textual and interpretive studies of R.H. Charles cautiously accept this assessment, although modifying it slightly to allow for the possibility that both *Jubilees* and *Sefer Asaph* utilized a common source.[9] While recognizing the discernible parallels between the two works, M. Himmelfarb has recently directed attention to a number of subtle differences that collectively discredit Jellinek's view regarding their direct literary relationship.[10] She moreover plausibly suggests that these discrepancies reflect the divergent programs of at least two separate circles of tradents, one of which (*Sefer Asaph*) was primarily interested in medical secrets, whereas the other (*Jubilees*) focused upon religious matters. If she is right, as seems likely, Charles's proposal of a common source to explain these texts' kinship accrues some additional support.

The tenth-century Karaite polemicist Salmon b. Jeroḥam makes mention of a "book of Shem b. Noah" (ספר שם בן נח) in his treatise entitled *The Book of the Wars of the Lord*.[11] Therein he links the "book of Shem" with the infamous *Sefer ha-Razim* ("Book of Secrets"), a Gaonic compilation of magical incantations and other esoterica. He brands both books as works which "hint at every vile (doctrine) of your (Rabbanite) teachers ... causing Israel to incur guilt and to sin, for in these works are contained ineffable

names that arouse love for men in the mind(s) of women (i.e., love-charms)."[12] Given the historically close association between magic and medicine, it is likely that Salmon b. Jeroham is referring here to a version of *Sefer Asaph*.[13] A less likely possibility for Salmon's "book of Shem" is a Judaeo-Arabic divinatory treatise, the opening sections of which are preserved on a single manuscript leaf recovered from the Cairo Genizah.[14] According to S. Hopkins, "the text belongs to the distinct and well-known genre of *Zuckungsliteratur*," whereby information about future events is derived through the observation of localized muscular contractions or twitches. Entitled כתאב אלאכתלאגאת ("Book of Twitches"), it is expressly ascribed to Shem b. Noah, and the list of prognostications is introduced with the phrase קאל שם בן נוח "Shem b. Noah said ..." (recto line 16). This leaf contains however no magical "names," and the remainder of the work is no longer extant. Hopkins also refers in passing to another Genizah fragment containing the beginning of an astrological work that is attributed to Shem.[15]

Another prognosticatory work ascribed to Shem is the so-called *Treatise of Shem*, an astrological almanac contained in a fifteenth-century Syriac manuscript.[16] This document "describes the characteristics of the year according to the house of the zodiac in which it begins,"[17] correlating the twelve signs of the zodiac (reversing however the sequence of Aquarius and Pisces) with a variety of human and natural calamities. A special interest is displayed in the rise and fall of the water level of the Nile River. In light of this latter interest, and given the demonstrable popularity of this genre of literature in Coptic and Egyptian Arabic sources, it seems likely that the text originated in Egypt. Its latest translator, J.H. Charlesworth, has sought to situate the text within first-century BCE Jewish circles,[18] but this early date for the work is almost universally rejected: most scholars opt for a date at least half a millennium later.[19] The name of Shem appears only once, in the opening line of the treatise, and there is no evidence contained within the work that inexorably binds it with the reputation of this particular forefather.

The Nag Hammadi collection of manuscripts includes a work entitled the *Paraphrase of Shem* (NHC VII.1). This intriguing book is a first-person account wherein Shem describes his ascent "to the top of the world, which is close to the light that shone upon the whole area there" (*Paraph. Shem* 1.9-11).[20] He is then instructed by an angel named Derdekeas about the origin of the cosmos and of humanity, and learns important information about the future progression of history, including forecasts of the coming Flood,[21] the destruction of Sodom, and the final consummation of the created order. Shem is repeatedly exhorted to promulgate the teachings which he received in his revelation to his descendants, who are characterized as the chosen "race of Light" whom Darkness will repeatedly persecute. He then "awoke as if from a long sleep (and) I marveled when I received the power of the Light and his whole thought" (*Paraph. Shem* 41.21-24),[22] a visceral circumstance suggestive of a dream-vision or trance-like state for the reception of the revelation.

Mandaean gnosticism also expresses some interest in the figure of Shem. In Mandaic texts he is usually referred to as Šum bar Nū; i.e., Shem son of Noah, and is accorded recognition together with his father as a renewer of the world after the Flood.[23] According to K. Rudolph, "er ist Stammvater der Mandäer, Vorbild und Repräsentant ihres Glaubens."[24] A prayer ascribed to him is included in the *Qōlāstā*, the standard collection of Mandaean liturgical hymns.[25] He also appears with the designation of Šum-Kušṭā, under which rubric he enjoys revelatory experiences.[26]

ἐλογιζόμην περὶ πάντων τῶν ἔργων ποίῳ τρόπῳ ἐγένοντο "I was thinking about the way that all things came to be." As in the "apocalypse" of Enosh previously discussed, it is sustained reflection on cosmogonic operations that stimulates Shem's revelatory experience. This interest parallels the Jewish esoteric speculations surrounding the topic termed מעשה בראשית, or the "work(s) of creation," a correspondence discussed more fully in Chapter Five above. One should note that the revelatory discourse of the Coptic *Paraphrase of Shem* commences with a detailed exposition of how the cosmos came into being,[27] although no analogous setting of individual perplexity or contemplation regarding creation is mentioned in that text. It seems possible that a common tradition about Shem's interest in this particular topic may underlie both works, although given the paucity of traditions contributory to a developed portrait of Shem, it is difficult to achieve certitude. On the other hand, a focus upon cosmogony is a leit-motif of gnostic literature, and it is hence not surprising that Shem should be portrayed as an earnest seeker after truth.

ἐμοῦ δὲ διαλογιζομένου ἐξα[ί]φνης ἥρπ[ασέν] με π[ν(εῦμ)α τὸ] ζῶν καὶ ἀν[ήνεγκεν βί]ᾳ μεγίστῃ [καὶ κατέ]στησεν κα[τὰ τὸ ἄκρον] ὄρους ὑψη[λοτάτου καὶ] εἶπ[εν πρὸς [ἐμέ οὕτω] λέ[γων· μὴ φοβοῦ, ἀλλὰ] δόξαν δὸς τῷ μεγίστῳ τῆς τιμῆς βασιλεῖ "While I pondered (these things), the Living S[pirit] suddenly to[ok] me and [lift]ed me with great f[orce, and se]t (me) on [the summit] of a lof[ty] mountain, [and] spoke [to me thusly, say]ing ['Do not be afraid; rather,] give praise to the Great King of Honor.'" The restorations in this pericope have been supplied from the plausible suggestions offered by the modern editors.[28] Of immediate interest is this passage's structural similarity to the opening lines of the "apocalypse" of Enosh, the citation which immediately precedes the Shem text in the *Codex*. While contemplating the mechanics of creation, Shem (like his ancestor Enosh) is transported by the "spirit" to a high mountain, where he is shown certain awesome sights and is schooled in various cosmic secrets. As suggested in our discussion of the Enosh fragments, the observable parallelism between the plot elements of these two texts kindles a suspicion that they are "pseudo-apocalypses"; i.e., artificial fabrications constructed by sectarian circles in order to supply these two forefathers with the requisite credentials demanded of gnostic "heralds." This suspicion gathers strength from the gratuitous occurrence within the Shem fragment of two recognizably Manichaean supernal entities: the Living Spirit and the Great King of Honor.

The Living Spirit is perhaps the most important cosmogonic agent in the Manichaean scheme of cosmic redemption.[29] According to the important sketch of Manichaean doctrine supplied by the eighth-century Nestorian patriarch Theodore bar Konai,[30] the Living Spirit (ܪܘܚܐ ܚܝܐ) was evoked in order to effect the rescue of Primal Man and his entourage from the clutches of the denizens of the Realm of Darkness. Primal Man and his five "sons" had previously sallied forth to engage the threatening forces of Darkness in battle, but their attempt to drive off the invaders resulted instead in an ignominious defeat: Primal Man suffered incarceration, while his "sons" were devoured by the ravenous victors. News of this catastrophe provoked a series of further evocations on the part of the Realm of Light, the last of whom was the Living Spirit. After evoking in turn his (sic!) five sons, one of whom is the Great King of Honor (ܡܠܟܐ ܪܒܐ ܕܝܩܪܐ), the Living Spirit proceeded with them and the so-called Mother of Life (ܐܡ ܕܚܝܐ) to the frontier where

> [they] found Primal Man and his five sons engulfed by Darkness. Then the Living Spirit cried out with his voice, and the voice of the Living Spirit was like a sharp sword, and it uncovered the form of Primal Man, and he said to him: 'Greetings to you, O Excellent One among evil entities, O Luminous One in the midst of Darkness, O Divine One dwelling among wrathful beasts who have no knowledge of <his> glory!' Then Primal Man answered him and said: 'Come in peace, O bringer of the merchandise of tranquility and peace!' And he said: 'How do our Fathers,[31] the Sons of Light, fare in their city?' The Caller answered him: 'They are faring well!' The Caller and the Respondent joined together and ascended to the Mother of Life and the Living Spirit.[32]

It remains unclear from Theodore's account precisely how the deliverance of Primal Man was physically accomplished, and the corresponding portion of Ibn al-Nadīm's Arabic narrative, which displays some points of contact with the Syriac narrative, is even more opaque.[33] However, an earlier fourth-century variant version of the crucial final scene depicts the liberation of Primal Man in concrete terms: "... the Father heard and sent another power ... called the Living Spirit and ... *descending he (the Living Spirit) gave to him (Primal Man) the right hand, and brought (him) out of the Darkness.*"[34] The import of this particular variant will emerge presently.

Having accomplished the rescue of Primal Man, the Living Spirit now takes steps to recover the five "sons" of Primal Man—those whom Mani termed the *ziwane*, literally "shining ones"[35]—from their digestive ordeal. Since their consumption by Darkness makes this task a more complicated endeavor, the Living Spirit concocts and executes a complex plan of demiurgic fabrication which results in the creation of the familiar material universe.[36] The heavens and earths are formed, the luminaries are installed, and mechanical processes are instigated by which the portions of Light trapped in the material cosmos (i.e., the *ziwane*) can be gradually distilled, purified, and eventually recovered. The five sons of the Living Spirit are each assigned supervisory tasks overseeing certain aspects of the refining process, with the Great King of Honor enthroned in the midst of the heavens in order to keep watch over the whole enterprise.[37]

The explicit naming of the Living Spirit and the Great King of Honor in the "apocalypse" of Shem is thus a clear indication of this fragment's actual provenance. One can, however, go even further in this present course of analysis by observing that the narrative movement of the "apocalypse" of Shem as rendered in the *Codex* mirrors several principal motifs found within the extant versions of the Manichaean myth about the redemption of Primal Man.[38] The correspondences which link the experiences of Shem and Primal Man can be summarized as follows: 1) The Living Spirit serves as the divine emissary in each instance; 2) the Living Spirit is the agent of removal in both instances—he rescues Primal Man from the Realm of Darkness, and snatches Shem out of the material world; 3) in each case the "voice" of the Living Spirit is personified as a separate entity, and it is the "voice" that acts as an arousing stimulus (see *CMC* 57.11-14 below); and 4) when the earlier variant description of Primal Man's redemption is taken into account, the grasping of the right hand (note our discussion of *kušṭā* above!) plays a prominent role in the resuscitation of each protagonist (see *CMC* 57.14-17 below).[39] Given these structural analogies, one can tentatively conclude that the Manichaean story about the rescue of Primal Man by the Living Spirit functions as the template for the formulation of the "apocalypse" of Shem.

If these similarities prove compelling, then the artificiality of the "apocalypse" of Shem, which was suspected on other grounds in our previous deliberations, becomes patent. This circumstance however need not exclude, as we shall see, the simultaneous incorporation and adaptation of authentically Jewish elements in the elaboration of the narrative. One must in fact expect that such adjustments would occur during the composition of the apocalypse in order to more securely anchor it in its purported cultural milieu.

καὶ πάλιν εἶπεν ὅτι σὺν ἡσυχίαι μὲν θύραι ἀνεπετάσθησαν, διῃρέθησαν δὲ καὶ νεφέλαι πρὸς τοῦ ἀνέμου "Moreover he says that 'silently doors were opened and clouds were parted by the wind ....'" The introductory words suggest a redactional seam, and the phrase can be rendered in Syriac as ...ܘ ܥܒܕ ܐܡܪ. This type of language would seem to indicate that a different portion of the "apocalypse" is being quoted at this juncture, and implies that an authentic source is being excerpted and copied by the editor. If however this narrative is actually a Manichaean "forgery," as we suggested above, the redactor may be deliberately employing this editorial phrasing in order to enhance the verisimilitude of the alleged ancient document.

The imagery of heavenly "doors" or "gates" which open to reveal what is concealed behind them to a seer or visionary occurs in Jewish (e.g., *1 Enoch* 14:15) and Christian (e.g., Rev 4:1) apocalyptic literature. Moreover, "clouds" are a common feature associated with a theophany and/or a visible act of the biblical deity,[40] although here the clouds serve as obscuring barriers which must be dispersed so that Shem can obtain clarity of vision. The converse of this image figures in Acts 1:9: "and after saying these things he was taken up while they watched, and a cloud removed him from their

sight,"[41] a nuance that emerges more forcefully in the Peshitta version of the last portion of this verse.[42]

Rev 4:1 (καὶ ἰδοὺ θύρα ἠνεῳγμένη ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ) is particularly interesting for our present purposes, for the passage goes on to describe a disembodied "voice" which invites the seer to enter through the open door. Doing so, the seer then beholds a splendid figure seated on a throne encircled by a rainbow (cf. Ezek 1:28) and surrounded by other thrones upon which are seated "elders" clad in white robes and wearing golden crowns. Shem too is accosted by a "voice," and also experiences a throne-vision which apparently involves the flashing of variegated colors. At first sight, this congruence seems astonishing, especially when considering that the Syriac version of the book of Revelation was probably not available before the sixth century CE.[43] However, given the rapid standardization of the symbolic vocabulary of theophanic visions in both Jewish and Christian apocalyptic literature, it should perhaps not occasion surprise that these two distinct scenes should exhibit such a uniformity of discourse.

εἶδον δὲ καθεστήριον ἐπίδοξον ἀπὸ τοῦ ὕψους τοῦ ἀνωτάτου κατερχόμενον καὶ μέγιστον ἄγγελον ἐφεστῶτα αὐτοῦ "I beheld a glorious throne-room descending from the heights and a mighty angel standing by it." The crucial word in this passage is the relatively rare term καθεστήριον, which based on the contexts in which it appears seems to connote a "chamber" or "inner room." Henrichs and Koenen refer to *T. Job* 25:2 in their *editio princeps*, and render the word as "Thronsaal," calling attention to *1 Enoch* 24:3 and Jewish *Hekhalot* literature.[44] Although it is far from clear that this is the actual meaning of the word, it is evident that some sort of enclosed space is intended. Given the events that subsequently transpire, "throne-room" is an appropriate rendering.

This scene is highly reminiscent of the one depicted in the final portion of the vision of the divine throne seen by the biblical prophet Ezekiel. We read there: "Above the firmament which was over their (the creatures') heads was the likeness of a throne, similar to sapphire in appearance; and above (it), on (עַל) the likeness of a throne, was something similar to a human being in appearance" (Ezek 1:26).[45] In other words, both seers behold what is apparently a throne as well as a supernal figure in close proximity to it. While Ezekiel seems to intimate that the figure is seated upon the throne, the language is nevertheless ambiguous regarding the specific disposition or posture of the figure. In fact, the preposition עַל allows a rendering of "near, by, at the side of" in certain contexts, and it is possible that a close reading of Ezekiel's vision could have generated a translation like "and above, *by* the likeness of a throne, was something similar to a human being in appearance." Such a reading may form the conceptual background of Shem's angelophany.

ἡ δὲ εἰκὼν τῆς ἰδέας τοῦ προσώπου αὐτοῦ πε[ρ]ικαλλὴς καὶ ὡραία ἐτύγ[χ]ανεν μᾶλλον τῆς στιλ[βούσης λα]μπηδόνος [τοῦ ἡλίο]υ, ἔτι δὲ καὶ [τῆς ἀστραπῆ]ς. παραπλη[σίως δὲ τοῖς] ἡλιακοῖς [..... .....]ε, [....]δε ἡ [στολὴ ἐν τῷ κάλλ]ει τῆς ποικιλίας στεφάνῳ πλακέντι ἐκ τῶν Φαρμουθικῶν ἀνθῶν "The image of the

form of his face was very beautiful and lovely, more than the brig[ht rad]iance [of the su]n, even more than [lightning]. Similarly [he radiated light like] sunlight, [and his robe ...] of diverse hues (?) like a crown plaited with May blossoms." This passage is extremely damaged, but enough verbiage survives to permit a tentative reconstruction of its essential components: those incorporated into the text were suggested by the modern editors of the *Codex*.[46] The subject concerns the physical appearance of the "mighty angel" (μέγιστον ἄγγελον) who was stationed near the καθεστήριον which descended in the presence of the astounded seer. Phrases extolling with superlative attributes the awesome beauty and radiant brilliance of heavenly entities are part of the stock repertoire of this type of literature. Interestingly, Ezek 1:27-28 (the passage immediately following the verse quoted above) now supplies a description of the splendor of the human figure who is seated on (or who is hovering nearby) the throne:

> I saw that his appearance from his loins upward was like that of *ḥašmal*, like fire within it and all around; and his appearance from his loins downward was like that of fire, and brilliance surrounded him. Like the appearance of the rainbow in a cloud on a rainy day, thus was the appearance of the encompassing brilliance. This was the appearance of the likeness of the Glory of the Lord.[47]

Of especial interest in the Shem passage is the possible reference to a multi-colored object, which the modern editors have suggested is the garment (ἡ [στολή]) worn by the angel. However, this seems unlikely, for entities associated with the heavens or the Realm of Light are invariably garbed in white robes, as is for example evidenced in *1 Enoch* 14:20: "And He who is great in glory sat on it, and his raiment was brighter than the sun, and whiter than any snow."[48] According to an Aramaic pseudepigraphon recovered from Qumran known as 4Q'Amram (4Q*543-548*),[49] the wicked ruler of the Realm of Darkness was clothed in a garment of many colors (ורשה צבעונין[ב]ל[ום]).[50] The reference in the "apocalypse" of Shem is thus probably not to clothing worn by the angel, but to the rainbow, as in Ezekiel's (1:28) and John of Patmos's (Rev 4:3) visions of the throne of God.

One should also observe that the Greek translators of the *Codex* have employed a Coptic month-name, that of Pharmouthi, to render the floral metaphor used of the appearance of the crown. According to *Kephalaia* 14.26-27, "it is in the [month] Pharmouthi that the vegetables are harvested"; hence this month indicates the season of ingathering. As pointed out by Henrichs and Koenen, the use of this particular designation suggests that the translation of the *Codex* from Syriac to Greek took place in Egypt.[51]

καὶ τότε ἠλλοιώθη ὁ χαρακτὴρ τοῦ προσώπου μου ὥστε καταπεσεῖν ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς. καὶ οἱ μὲν σφόνδυλοι τοῦ νώτου μου διεκλονήθησαν, οἱ δὲ πόδες μου οὐκ ἔστησαν ἐπὶ τοὺς ἀστραγάλους "Then the feature(s) of my face changed so that I collapsed upon the ground. The vertebrae of my back shook, and my feet could not stand upon the joints." As we saw above in our discussion of the "apocalypse" of Enosh, this particular type of corporeal reaction to a manifestation of the divinity possesses its closest verbal parallels in Mandaean literature. It is likely that both streams of tradition; i.e., Manichaean

and Mandaean, are here reliant upon a common cultural idiom, and it would appear that the underlying model is, once again, Ezekiel's inaugural vision: "When I saw (it; i.e., the sight described above), I collapsed upon my face..." (Ezek 1:28b).[52]

παρέκυψεν δέ μοι φωνὴ καλοῦσα ἀπὸ τοῦ καθεστηρίου "A voice bent over me, calling from the throne-room ...." Echoes of the Manichaean mythos become more pronounced at this stage of the narrative's progression. Shem has collapsed and is now utterly helpless to react to further external provocation, a situation that is metaphorically parallel to that of Primal Man in the cosmic *Urdrama*. Just as the "voice" of the Living Spirit is the essential agent in the arousal and redemption of Primal Man, so too here a personified "voice" (note its hypostasized attributes: it "bends over," it "clasps," it "lifts," and it "breathes") restores vitality to the prostrate Shem.

The sudden manifestation of a "voice" in a theophanic setting is paralleled in Ezekiel's influential vision. After his collapse, he hears "a voice speaking" (1:28c)![53] It is also reminiscent of the aural phenomenon of the בת קול in postbiblical Jewish literature, which is similarly construed as a disembodied heavenly voice emanating from the sacred realm. Episodes wherein this voice speaks to one or more hearers recur many times in rabbinic texts, usually in contexts where a divine pronouncement is requisite.[54] This motif also figures in revelatory literature whose setting is similar to that predicated of Shem in this fragmentary "apocalypse." Compare for example the following episode from a *Hekhalot* text that parallels our passage: "R. Akiba said, 'Once when I ascended to the Merkavah (i.e., the divine throne-room) a voice (בת קול) issued forth from beneath the Throne of Glory speaking Aramaic as follows ....'"[55] Here, as in the Shem fragment, the voice calls to the hearer from the vicinity of a heavenly throne. However, the בת קול does not exhibit the hypostatic qualities displayed by the φωνή in the "apocalypse" of Shem; that is to say, it never "bends," "grasps," "lifts," or "breathes" in classical Jewish sources. Such peculiar behavior in the Shem fragment derives, as we have seen, from its mythological prototype; namely, the Manichaean Living Spirit.

καὶ ἐπελθοῦσά μοι τῆς χειρὸς ἐλάβετο τῆς δεξιᾶς καὶ ἀνέστησεν. φυσήσασα δὲ κατ[ὰ] τῆς ὄψεώς μου ἄσθμ[α] ζωῆς προσθήκην [μοι] δυνάμεως εἰργά[σατο καὶ] δόξης "and having approached me took my right hand and raised (me and) blew a breath of life into my nostrils, increas[ing my] power [and] glory." The grasping of the "right hand" by the "spirit" further cements this passage's connections with the salvific ideology of Syro-Mesopotamian gnosis, as we have repeatedly seen. It is of course the specific rescuing gesture that might have been expected from the Living Spirit, who here recapitulates his primordial recovery of Primal Man. What is of particular interest here is the respiratory vivification of Shem. The language used is distinctly reminiscent of Gen 2:7, the biblical verse which recounts the deity's animation of Adam: "and the Lord God formed Adam from the dirt of the ground, *and He blew into his nostrils the breath of life*, and Adam became a living being."[56] In

the biblical text, it is the "breath of life" that transforms recumbant Adam from inert matter to an animate being.[57] Similarly the "apocalypse" ascribes transformative powers to the divine "breath of life," which in Shem's case results in an augmentation of his "power" (δύναμις) and "glory" (δόξα). Does this mean that Shem was not simply comatose, but actually dead prior to his resuscitation and/or apotheosis?

Given the increasingly discernible impact that the inaugural vision of Ezekiel had upon the construction of this pericope, it should hardly surprise us that an alternative solution to our query emerges upon a close examination of Ezek 2:1-2, the passage that immediately follows 1:28 above: "And it (the voice) said to me, 'Mortal man, stand on your feet, and I will address you!' And a spirit (רוח) entered me while it (the voice) spoke to me, and it (the spirit) stood me upon my feet ...."[58]

Light is also shed on this particular episode from an analogous scene which occurs in Jewish *Hekhalot* literature. The so-called *3 Enoch* begins with an allegedly first-person account by R. Ishmael of his own ascent to the heights of heaven in order to view the Merkavah; i.e., the divine throne-chariot depicted in Ezekiel 1 and 10. He safely proceeds through the first six "palaces" (*hekhalot*) without incident, but as he draws near the gate to the seventh palace, he beseeches God to grant him protection from its threatening angelic guardians. Immediately the angel Metatron

> came forth to meet me with great joy in order to deliver me from their power, *and he grasped me with his hand* in their sight, and said to me, 'Enter in peace, for you have been found worthy before the High and Exalted One to view the appearance of the Merkavah!' At that time I entered the seventh palace, and he led me to the encampment of the Shekinah *and placed me before the Throne of Glory* in order to view the Merkavah. When the princes of the Merkavah and the fiery seraphs set their eyes on me, immediately *I began to shake and tremble, and I collapsed from where I was standing and fell unconscious* due to the bright appearance of their eyes and the gleaming appearance of their faces. (This state continued) until the Holy One, blessed be He, rebuked them and said to them, 'O My attendants—My seraphim, My cherubim, and My ophanim—cover your eyes before Ishmael, My son, My friend, My beloved, and My honored one, so that he will not shake and tremble!' Immediately Metatron, prince of the Presence, came *and restored my breath to me, and set me back up on my feet* ....[59]

As can be observed from the underscored clauses, this particular text displays several remarkable correspondences with the latter section of the Shem fragment, even though the sequence of the events which are depicted varies between them. In both instances the setting for the theophany involves a visual experience of a heavenly throne-room. Both seers react with marked fear and trepidation, including corporeal distress and paralysis; both are greeted by an "angelic" attendant with a handclasp (although "right hand" is not specified in the *3 Enoch* text); and perhaps most intriguing of all, both must have their "breath" (נשמה; cf. Gen 2:7) restored by this attendant before regaining their composure. It would appear that both of these texts have been constructed out of a common cultural lexicon of mystical mythemes,

with variance of articulation occurring primarily at the level of one's particular religious identity.

Interestingly, there has recently emerged further evidence that one of the dangers threatening the Jewish mystics who dared to ascend and gaze upon the glorious throne-room of the deity was the loss of one's "breath" or "spirit." According to a fragment of an otherwise unattested *Hekhalot* tractate that has been recovered from the Cairo Genizah,[60] the fear aroused in the visionary from the awesome sights endured in the course of the experience might actually expel the "spirit" from the body. To prevent this from happening, special instructions are given to the seer by the guiding angel Ozhayah. After assuming a prostrate position, "... stick cotton in your ears and cotton in your nose and cotton in your anus *so that your breath will stay in and not go out* until I reach you. *And I will come and stand by you and fan you, and your spirit will return* and your soul will live."[61] This remarkable text, despite its relatively late date, explicates the reason why R. Ishmael (*3 Enoch*) and Shem (*CMC* "apocalypse") require the resuscitory efforts of their respective attending angels. The loss of "breath" is an inevitable result of their angelophanic experiences. One might also note that even when the requisite protective steps are taken, it is still necessary for the angel to "blow" (מנופף) the escaping "spirit" (רוח) back into the body of the heavenly voyager. The Shem passage provides the earliest attested instance of this particular motif in this type of literature.[62]

πλεῖς[τα δὲ] καὶ ἄλλα τούτ[ο]ι[ς παρα]πλ[ήσια ὑ]πάρ[χει ἐν ταῖ]ς αὐτοῦ γραφαῖς, καὶ τίνα ἀπεκάλυψαν αὐτῷ οἱ ἄγγελοι εἰπόντες γράψαι αὐτὰ πρὸς ὑπομνηματισμόν
"Numer[ous] other [simil]ar things are in his writings, including that which the angels revealed to him saying, 'Write these things for a memoir!'" As is the case with the other forefathers whose "words" are cited in this section of the *Codex*, Shem too is exhorted by heavenly beings to record his experiences and wisdom for the benefit of future generations. This interest in antiquarian records accords with the Manichaean emphasis upon the production and preservation of authoritative written testimonia recounting the earlier divine revelations and teachings. Unlike the "apocalypses" of Adam and Enosh, no specific instructions are given to Shem regarding what materials to use in the preparation of his "memoir."

The imperative mood of address ('Write these things for a memoir!') possesses a verbal parallel in the aforementioned Ozhayah fragment recovered from the Cairo Genizah. Therein the angel Ozhayah commands the anonymous seer: "Record and leave the seal of the 'descent of the Merkavah' for the inhabitants of the world, for you and for whoever seeks to 'descend' and behold the King in his beauty."[63]

Summary

Of the five allegedly Jewish "apocalypses" cited by Baraies in this section of the *Codex*, the "apocalypse" of Shem displays the clearest signs of sectarian adaptation, manipulation, or perhaps even composition. The Coptic *Paraphrase of Shem* and this "apocalypse" are the only surviving examples of literary texts ascribed to this forefather by any religious community prior to the second half of the first millennium CE, and it is surely suggestive that both of these works belong within the general milieu of late antique gnostic religiosity. While the status of Shem undergoes a visible elevation already within certain circles of Second Temple era Jewish tradents, it is primarily among gnostic groups that Shem achieves recognition as an independent author and privileged recipient of cosmic mysteries.

The Shem fragments are thus most profitably viewed as a Manichaean (or proto-Manichaean) "forgery." Nevertheless, despite its artificial character, there are several indications that the author or compiler of the "apocalypse" of Shem was privy to a general collection of nuanced traditions surrounding the modes and media of angelophanic revelation, an assemblage of motifs and terms that was also visibly exploited by those diverse groups responsible for the production of Jewish *Hekhalot* tractates, Manichaean mythologoumena, and Mandaean ascent-experiences. Such affinity of expression should not be surprising, given these groups' common Syro-Mesopotamian cultural setting. Furthermore, the rhetorical similarities repeatedly discerned among certain of their textual productions prompts the religionist to conclude that at some level these different communities were consciously trafficking in discursive wares that served them all as common coin. One need only invoke the so-called "interdenominational" character of the Aramaic ritual-bowl inscriptions that have been recovered from late antique Mesopotamia,[64] and the resultant difficulties scholars experience in establishing an individual bowl's actual religious provenance, in order to underscore this aspect of their ideological relationship.

NOTES

[1]*CMC* 55.10-58.5. Text cited from L. Koenen and C. Römer, *Der Kölner Mani-Kodex ... Kritische Edition* (Opladen: Westdeutscher Verlag, 1988) 36-38.

[2]L. Ginzberg, *The Legends of the Jews* (7 vols.; Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society, 1909-38) 5.167. Note *S. 'Olam Rab.* 1 (end): ושבעה בני אדם שקפלו את [כל] העולם כולו [וראו זה את זה ולמדו תורה זה מזה] ואלו הן אדם הראשון ומתושלח ושם ויעקב ועמרם ואחיה השילוני ואליהו ועדיין הוא קיים "and seven humans who overlap one another through the whole (of the history) of the world, [and each successor 'saw' his predecessor, and learned Torah directly from him], and these are they: Adam the protoplast, Methuselah, Shem, Jacob, Amram, Ahijah the Shilonite, and Elijah, who still lives." Compare *b. B. Bat.* 121b. Text of *Seder 'Olam Rabbah* cited from A. Neubauer, *Mediaeval Jewish Chronicles and Chronological Notes* (2 vols.; reprinted, Amsterdam: Philo Press, 1970) 2.27. Compare *T. Benj.* 10:6: τότε ὄψεσθε Ἐνώχ, Νῶε καὶ Σὴμ καὶ Ἀβραὰμ καὶ Ἰσαὰκ καὶ Ἰακὼβ ἀνισταμένους ἐκ δεξιῶν ἐν ἀγαλλιάσει "Then you will see Enoch, Noah, and Shem, and Abraham, and Isaac, and Jacob, rising on the right hand in gladness." Text cited from M. de Jonge, *The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs: A Critical Edition of the Greek Text* (PVTG 1.2; Leiden: Brill, 1978); translation is that of idem, "The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs," *AOT* (Sparks) 599.

[3]Sometimes referred to as the "academy of Shem and Eber." The primitive formulation of this motif is already visible in *Jub.* 12:27 and 21:10. Note also the medieval Hebrew *T. Naph.* 8:6, which weds the Second Temple and rabbinic understandings of Shem's significance: ולא נשאר לשון הקודש לשון עברי כי אם בבית שם ועבר ובבית אברהם אבינו שהוא מבני בניהן "But the holy language, the Hebrew language, remained only in the house of Shem and Eber, and in the house of Abraham our father, who is one of their descendants." Text cited from M. Gaster, "The Hebrew Text of one of the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs," in idem, *Studies and Texts in Folklore, Magic, Mediaeval Romance, Hebrew Apocrypha and Samaritan Archaeology* (3 vols.; reprinted, New York: Ktav, 1971) 3.28; its stichometry and translation taken from *APOT* 2.363.

[4]See Chapter Three, n.46 above.

[5]See S. Müntner, *Mavo' le-sefer Asaf ha-Rofe'* (Jerusalem: Geniza, 1957) 147-57 for a selection of passages drawn from this work. Unfortunately the entire text has never been published. For further discussion and references, note *Bet ha-Midrasch* (= *BHM*) (6 vols.; ed. A. Jellinek; Jerusalem: Bamberger & Wahrmann, 1938) 3.xxx-xxxii; R. Gottheil, "Asaph ben Berechiah," *JE* 2.162-63; S. Müntner, "Asaph ha-Rofe," *EncJud* 3.673-76; M. Himmelfarb, "Some Echoes of *Jubilees* in Medieval Hebrew Literature," *Tracing the Threads: Studies in the Vitality of Jewish Pseudepigrapha* (SBLEJL 6; ed. J.C. Reeves; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1994) 127-35; W. Adler, "Jacob of Edessa and the Jewish Pseudepigrapha in Syriac Chronography," ibid. 165.

[6]This particular phrase designates the "spirits" of the antediluvian giants who perished during the Flood. According to *1 Enoch* 15:8-16:1 (cf. *Jub.* 10:1-14), these malevolent spirits will torment humankind with diverse afflictions "until the day of consummation, of the great judgment, when the great aeon is completed" (μέχρις ἡμέρας τελειώσεως, τῆς κρίσεως τῆς μεγάλης, ἐν ᾗ ὁ αἰὼν ὁ μέγας τελεσθήσεται [16:1]). Earlier in the Greek text of *1 Enoch*, the giants were termed τοὺς μαζηρέους (10:9), a word long recognized as being a loan from ממזרים "bastards." Further usage of the identical Hebrew phrase (i.e., רוחות (ה)ממזרים) to represent the same entities appears in 4Q*510* 1 line 5; 4Q*511* 35 line 7, 48-51 lines 2-3 (?), and 182 line 1 (?); for these texts see DJD VII 216, 237, 243, 261. For discussion, see J.C. Reeves, *Jewish Lore in Manichaean Cosmogony: Studies in the Book of Giants Traditions* (Cincinnati: Hebrew Union College Press, 1992) 133 n.53.

[7]זה ספר הרפואות אשר העתיקו חכמים הראשונים מספר שם בן נח אשר נמסר לנח בלובר ההר מהררי אררט אחרי המבול כי בימים ההמה ובעת ההיא החלו רוחות הממזרים להתגרות בבני נח להשטות ולהטעות ולחבל ולהכות בחלאים ובמכאובים ובכל מיני מדוה הממיתים ומשחיתים את בני אדם ... ואת רפואות נגעי בני אדם וכל מיני רפואות הגיד המלאך לרפא בעצי הארץ וצמחי האדמה ועיקריה וישלח את שרי הרוחות הנותרים מהם להראות לנח ולהגיד לו את עצי הרפואות עם כל דשאיהם וירקיהם ועשביהם ועיקריהם וזירועיהם למה נבראו וללמדו כל דברי רפואתם למרפא ולחיים ויכתב נח את הדברים האלה על ספר ויתנהו לשם בנו הגדול ומן הספר הזה העתיקו חכמי הראשונים ויכתבו ספרים הרבה איש ואיש כלשונו . Text cited from the edition of the introduction to *Sefer Asaph* provided in *BHM* 3.155 under the rubric *Sefer Noah.* R.H. Charles reproduces the relevant part of Jellinek's text in his *Maṣḥafa Kufālē, or the Ethiopic Version of the Hebrew Book of Jubilees* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1895) 179; compare also Müntner, *Mavo'* 147-49. Translation is adapted from that of Himmelfarb, "Some Echoes of *Jubilees*" 129-30.

[8]*BHM* 3.xxx-xxxii; the quotation occurs on p. xxxi.

[9]Charles, *Ethiopic Version* x ("fragments of the Hebrew original [of *Jubilees*] have come down to us embedded in the Midrashim ..."); see also ibid. 179 ("... is based partly on the Book of Jubilees"); *APOT* 2.4 ("Fragments of the original Hebrew text or of the sources used by its author are to be found in the Book of Noah [i.e., *Sefer Asaph*] ..."). Similarly K. Berger, *Das Buch der Jubiläen* (JSHRZ II.3; Gütersloh: G. Mohn, 1981) 298. J.C. VanderKam does not include this later material in the useful synoptic edition of "Versional Evidence" featured in his *The Book of Jubilees: A Critical Text* (CSCO 510, scrip. aeth. 87; Louvain: Peeters, 1989) 257-300.

[10]Himmelfarb, "Some Echoes of *Jubilees*" 130-34.

[11]See Salmon ben Yeroḥam, *Milḥamot ha-Shem (The Book of the Wars of the Lord)* (ed. I. Davidson; New York: The Jewish Theological Seminary of America, 1934) 111.

[12]כל תועבת רבותיך שבספר רזים ובספר שם בן נח נרמזים ... להחטיא את ישראל ולהאשים כי באלה השמות המפורשים מכניסים אהבת אנשים בלב נשים . Text cited from the quotation supplied in *Sefer ha-Razim: A Newly Recovered Book of Magic from the Talmudic Period* (ed. M. Margalioth; Jerusalem: American Academy for Jewish Research, 1966) 37.

[13]*BHM* 2.xxx n.2; Müntner, *EncJud* 3.674.

[14]T-S A45.21. See S. Hopkins, *A Miscellany of Literary Pieces from the Cambridge Genizah Collection* (Cambridge University Library Genizah Series 3; Cambridge: Cambridge University Library, 1978) 67-71, which provides photographs, a transcription, and a translation.

[15]T-S Ar.10.15, referred to by Hopkins, *Miscellany* 67 n.7. There is apparently no connection with the Syriac *Treatise of Shem.*

[16]A. Mingana, "Some Early Judaeo-Christian Documents in the John Rylands University Library: Syriac Texts," *BJRL* 4 (1917-18) 59-118.

[17]J.H. Charlesworth, "Treatise of Shem," *OTP* 1.473.

[18]J.H. Charlesworth, "Rylands Syriac Ms. 44 and a New Addition to the Pseudepigrapha: The Treatise of Shem, Discussed and Translated," *BJRL* 60 (1977-78) 376-403; idem, *OTP* 1.473-80.

[19]See especially the critiques of Brock and Alexander as cited in Chapter Two, n.56 above, to which can be added D. Bundy, "Pseudepigrapha in Syriac Literature," *Society of Biblical Literature 1991 Seminar Papers* (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1991) 755-56.

[20]Translation is that of *The Nag Hammadi Library in English* (3d ed.; ed. J.M. Robinson; San Francisco: Harper & Row, 1988) 341. Interestingly, Ginzberg refers to an obscure text that conflates the *Sefer Asaph* tradition with an otherwise unattested ascent of Shem to heaven: "after the flood an angel took one of Noah's sons (i.e., Shem) to paradise, where he revealed to him all kinds of remedies, which the latter wrote down in a book" (*Legends* 5.197).

[21]This oracle necessarily situates Shem's ascent-experience in the antediluvian period, a circumstance that distinguishes it from the one referenced by Ginzberg in the preceding note.

[22]*Nag Hammadi Library*[3] (ed. Robinson) 358.

[23]*Right Ginzā* 28.3-7; 46.2-6; 410.6-8 (ed. Lidzbarski). See K. Rudolph, *Die Mandäer* (2 vols.; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1960-61) 1.163 n.5; idem, *Theogonie, Kosmogonie und Anthropogonie in den mandäischen Schriften* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1965) 300; E. Segelberg, "Old and New Testament Figures in Mandaean Version," *Syncretism: Based on Papers read at the Symposium on Cultural Contact, Meeting of Religions, Syncretism held at Åbo on the 8th-10th of September, 1966* (ed. S.S. Hartman; Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell, 1969) 234-35.

[24]Rudolph, *Mandäer* 1.83 n.1.

[25]M. Lidzbarski, *Mandäische Liturgien* (Berlin: Weidmannsche Buchhandlung, 1920) 49; Segelberg, "Figures" 234.

[26]M. Lidzbarski, *Das Johannesbuch der Mandäer* (2 vols.; Giessen: A. Töpelmann, 1905-15) 2.58-70; note especially p. 58: "Auch den Mandäern gilt Sem, sicher unter jüdischem Einfluss, als Repräsentant ihrer Gemeinschaft, und sie bezeichnen ihn geradezu als Kušṭā." See also Rudolph, *Mandäer* 1.163 n.5; idem, *Theogonie* 302.

[27]*Paraph. Shem* 1.21-28: "... hear and understand what I shall say to you first concerning the great powers who were in existence in the beginning, before I (i.e., Derdekeas) appeared. There was Light and Darkness and there was Spirit between them." Translation cited from *Nag Hammadi Library*[3] (ed. Robinson) 342.

[28]Koenen-Römer, *Kritische Edition* 36.

[29]See A.V.W. Jackson, *Researches in Manichaeism* (New York, 1932; reprinted, New York: AMS Press, 1965) 288-95; H.-C. Puech, *Le manichéisme: son fondateur - sa doctrine* (Paris: Civilisations du Sud, 1949) 78-79.

[30]For the Syriac text, see H. Pognon, *Inscriptions mandaïtes des coupes de Khouabir* (Paris, 1898; reprinted, Amsterdam: Philo Press, 1979) 125-31; Theodore bar Konai, *Liber Scholiorum* (CSCO scrip. syri, ser. II, t. 66; ed. A. Scher; Paris: Carolus Poussielgue, 1912) 311-18.

[31]Compare Theodore bar Konai, *Liber Scholiorum* (ed. Scher) 317.24: ܐܒܗܬܐ ܕܥܠܝܐ "Fathers on high," and the terminology found in *CMC* 34.1-10 (ed. Koenen-Römer 20): *τῶν] τοῦ φωτὸς πατέρων* καὶ πάντα τὰ γιγνόμενα ἐν τοῖς πλοίοις ἀπεκάλυπτέ μοι. ἀνέπτυξε δ' αὖ πάλιν τὸν κόλπον τοῦ κίονος *καὶ τοὺς πατέρας* καὶ τὰ σθένη τὰ ἀλκιμώτατα [τὰ ἀ]ποκρυπτόμενα ἐ[ν αὐτῷ τούτῳ ... "*of the Fathers of Light* and all those things taking place in the Vessels he revealed to me. Moreover,

he disclosed the 'Womb of the Column,' *the 'Fathers,'* and the mighty powers concealed i[n it (i.e., the 'Column'?) ...]." Cf. also *CMC* 14.1; *Kephalaia* 273.20: "Fathers of Light."

[32]Theodore bar Konai, *Liber Scholiorum* (ed. Scher) 314.21-315.4: ܐܫܬܥܝ ܕܒܗܝ ܕܒܪ ܚܠܡ ܚܫܟܐ ܐܡ ܕܚܫܟܐ ܬܡܢ ܫܡܐ ܕܒܪ ܫܡ ܗܘ ܐܡܪ ܠܗ ܠܝ ܐܢܐ ܗܘ ܕܐܬܝ ܠܡܫܟ ܒܢܝ ܐܢܫܐ

[37]Theodore bar Konai, *Liber Scholiorum* (ed. Scher) 315.16-18: ܐܬܒܢܝ ܫܡܝܐ ܘܐܪܥܐ ܐܬܥܒܕ ܡܠܟܐ ܪܒܐ ܕܝܩܪܐ ܘܝܬܒ ܒܡܨܥ ܫܡܝܐ ܘܢܛܪ ܠܟܠ ܐܬܪ ܘܐܬܪ "After the heavens and earths were made, the Great King of Honor took a seat in the midst of the heavens and kept watch over the whole."

[38]Reeves, *Jewish Lore* 188-89 provides a brief summary of the most important sources.

[39]*Psalm-Book* 2.5 speaks of "the Living Spirit, our first Right Hand," a clear allusion to the earlier form of the redemption scene. However, *Kephalaia* 38.20 ascribes the "first right hand" to the Mother of Life. Compare *CMC* 19.4-7: ἐκ τοῦ π(ατ)ρ(ὸ)ς τοῦ ἡμετέρου καὶ τῆς ἀποπρὸ πρώτης δεξιᾶς ἀγαθῆς "from our Father and the distant, first, good right hand." It is unclear which entity is intended by the *Codex* epithet, although in context the Living Spirit would seem to be the most suitable choice.

[40]See Exod 19:9; 24:15; 40:35-38; Num 9:15-22; 11:25; 12:5, 10; Ezek 1:4; 10:4; Ps 18:12-13; etc. Both "doors" and "clouds" are present in Ps 78:23 (ויצו שחקים ממעל ודלתי שמים פתח), a poetic elaboration of the traditional divine provisioning of the Israelites wandering in the wilderness.

[41]καὶ ταῦτα εἰπὼν βλεπόντων αὐτῶν ἐπήρθη, καὶ νεφέλη ὑπέλαβεν αὐτὸν ἀπὸ τῶν ὀφθαλμῶν αὐτῶν. The cloud of incense produced by the Israelite high priest immediately prior to his entrance within the Holy of Holies on the Day of Atonement (see Lev 16:12-13) serves the same "obscuring" function by protecting the ministrant from an accidental fatal glimpse of the divine glory.

[42]ܘܐܬܓܢܙ ܡܢ ܚܙܘܬܗܘܢ "and he was hidden from their view." See A.J.H.W. Brandt, *Die mandäische Religion* (Leipzig, 1889; reprinted, Amsterdam: Philo Press, 1973) 154.

[43]B.M. Metzger, *The Early Versions of the New Testament: Their Origin, Transmission, and Limitations* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1977) 65-68.

[44]*ZPE* 19 (1975) 57 n.97. See also I. Gruenwald, "Manichaeism and Judaism in Light of the Cologne Mani Codex," *ZPE* 50 (1983) 29-45; B. Visotzky, "Rabbinic Randglossen to the Cologne Mani Codex," *ZPE* 52 (1983) 295-300; J.C. Reeves, "Jewish Pseudepigrapha in Manichaean Literature: The Influence of the Enochic Library," *Tracing the Threads* (ed. Reeves) 176-81.

[45]וממעל לרקיע אשר על ראשם כמראה אבן ספיר דמות כסא ועל דמות הכסא דמות כמראה אדם עליו מלמעלה.

[46]Koenen-Römer, *Kritische Edition* 36-38. See also *ZPE* 19 (1975) 56-57.

[47]וארא כעין חשמל כמראה אש בית לה סביב ממראה מתניו ולמעלה וממראה מתניו ולמטה ראיתי כמראה אש וגגה לו סביב כמראה הקשת אשר יהיה בענן ביום הגשם כן מראה הנגה סביב הוא מראה דמות כבוד יי.

[48]Translation is that of M.A. Knibb, "1 Enoch," *AOT* (Sparks) 202.

[49]J.T. Milik, "4Q Visions de 'Amram et une citation d'Origène," *RB* 79 (1972) 77-97; P.J. Kobelski, *Melchizedek and Melchireša'* (Washington, DC: Catholic Biblical Association of America, 1981) 24-36; K. Beyer, *Die aramäischen Texte vom Toten Meer* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1984) 210-14.

[50]4Q'Amram^{b} 1 13, cited from Milik, *RB* 79 (1972) 79, and note further his remarks and references on p. 81.

[51]*ZPE* 19 (1975) 82 n.99*.

[52]... וארא ואפל על פני.

[53]ואשמע קול מדבר.

[54]See for example *b. Yoma* 9b; *b. Meg.* 3a; *b. Ḥag.* 14b; *b. B. Meṣ.* 59a-b. Such instances can easily be multiplied; cf. the rich array of examples supplied by L. Blau, "Bat Ḳol," *JE* 2.588-92; A. Rofé, "Bat Kol," *EncJud* 4.324-25. One might compare Mark 1:11; 9:7; Acts 10:13; Rev 4:1.

[55]*Hekhalot Zuṭarti*, from Ms. München 22 (ed. Schäfer §348): אמ״ר עקיבא באותה שעה שעליתי למרכבה יצתה בת קול מתוח כסא הכבוד מדברת לשון ארמית כלשון הזה ....

[56]וייצר יי אלהים את האדם עפר מן האדמה ויפח באפיו נשמת חיים ויהי האדם לנפש חיה.

[57]Note Abraham ibn Ezra *ad* Gen 2:7: וטעם לנפש חיה שהלך מיד כמו החיות ולא כתינוקים "and the meaning of '... (became) a living being'? He could immediately walk, as in the case of animals, and unlike (human) infants." Compare *Tg. Onq.* Gen 2:7b: ונפח באפוהי נשמתא דחיי והוה באדם לרוח ממללא, which views the divine "breath" as endowing Adam with the gift of speech, to which *Tg. Ps.-J.* adds the faculties of sight and audition.

[58]ויאמר אלי בן אדם עמד על רגליך ואדבר אתך ותבא בי רוח כאשר דבר אלי ותעמדני על רגלי.

[59]יצא לקראתי בשמחה רבה להצילני מידם ותפשני בידו לעיניהם ואמר לי בא בשלום שנחרצית לפני רם ונשא להסתכל בדמות המרכבה באותה שעה נכנסתי להיכל שביעי והדריכני למחנה שכינה והציגני לפני כסא הכבוד להסתכל במרכבה וכיון שראוני שרי המרכבה ושרפי להבה נתנו עיניהם בי מיד נרתעתי ונזדעזעתי ונפלתי מעומדי ונרדמתי מפני זוהר דמות עיניהם וזיו מראה פניהם עד שגער בהם ה״ב״ה ואמר להם משרתי שרפיי כרוביי ואופניי כסו עיניכם מלפני ישמעאל בני אהובי חביבי וכבודי שלא ירתע ושלא יזדעזע מיד בא מטטרון שר הפנים והחזיר לי את נשמתי והציגני על רגלי ... Text of *3 Enoch* cited from Ms. Vat. 228 (ed. Schäfer §§1-2).

[60]Known as the Ozhayah Fragment on account of the name of the angel who delivers instructions and warnings to the initiates. See I. Gruenwald, "New Passages from Hekhalot Literature," *Tarbiz* 38 (1968-69) 354-72 (Hebrew), esp. pp. 360-61 lines 43-49; P. Schäfer, *Geniza-Fragmente zur Hekhalot-Literatur* (Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr, 1984) 103 lines 43-49.

[61]ומוך באזנך ומוך בחוטמך ומוך בטבעתך כדי שתהא לה עכבה לנשמתך ולא תצא עד שאני מגיע אותך ובאתי אני ועומד עליך ומנופף עליך וחוזרת רוחיך וחייתה נפשך (Gruenwald, *Tarbiz* 38 [1968-69] 360 lines 44-46). Translation is that of M. Himmelfarb, "Heavenly Ascent and the Relationship of the Apocalypses and the *Hekhalot* Literature," *HUCA* 59 (1988) 87. See also I. Gruenwald, *Apocalyptic and Merkavah Mysticism* (Leiden: Brill, 1980) 189-90.

[62]Gruenwald perceptively observes that "... it is not unlikely that the Elchasaites were in one way or another connected with the circles of the Merkavah mystics, who in turn were the spiritual offspring of the apocalyptic visionaries. It is still an open question, whether these alleged connections were a result of an acquaintance that derived from literary sources or whether it was based on real and first-hand acquaintance with—or even affiliation to—certain, perhaps remote, Jewish mystics who lived in Babylonia." Quotation cited from his "Manichaeism and Judaism" 44.

[63]Gruenwald, *Tarbiz* 38 (1968-69) 358 lines 24-25: ואתה כתוב והנח חותם ירידת המרכבה לבאי העולם לך ולמי שהוא מבקש לירד להציץ במלך וביופו.

[64]I have borrowed this felicitous adjective from the perspicacious remarks of S. Shaked, *Dualism in Transformation: Varieties of Religion in Sasanian Iran* (London: School of Oriental and African Studies, 1994) 82.

CHAPTER SEVEN

THE APOCALYPSE OF ENOCH

Text

πάλιν καὶ ὁ Ἐνὼχ τοῦτον τὸν τρόπον ἔφη ἐν τῇ αὐτοῦ ἀποκαλύψει· ἐγώ εἰμι Ἐνὼχ ὁ δίκαιος. λύπη μοί ἐστιν μεγάλη καὶ χύσις δακρύων ἐκ τῶν ὀφθαλμῶν μου διὰ τὸ ἀκηκοέναι με τὸν ὀνειδισμὸν τὸν προελθόντα ἐκ στόματος τῶν ἀ[σ]εβῶν. ἔλεγεν δὲ [ὅ]τι τῶν δακρύων ἐν [τοῖ]ς ὀφθαλμοῖς μου ὄν[των] καὶ δεήσεως ἐν τῷ [στό]ματι ἐθεώρησα ἐπι[στάν]τας μοι ἀγγέλους ἑ[πτὰ ἐκ το]ῦ οὐρανοῦ κα[τερχομέ]νου[ς. ἰδὼν δὲ] αὐτοὺς ἐκινήθην ὑπὸ δέους ὥστε τὰ γόνατά μου ἀλλήλοις προσαράσσειν. καὶ πάλιν εἶπεν οὕτως· ἔφη μοι εἷς τῶν ἀγγέλων Μιχαὴλ τοὔνομα· τούτου χάριν πρὸς σὲ ἀπεστάλην ἵνα ὑποδείξωμέν σοι πάντα τὰ ἔργα καὶ ἀποκαλύψωμέν σοι τὸν τῶν εὐσεβῶν χῶρον καὶ χῶρόν σοι δείξω τὸν τῶ[ν] δυσσεβῶν καὶ ὁποῖος τυγχάνει ὁ τῆς τιμωρίας τῶν ἀνόμων τόπος. φησὶ δὲ πάλιν ὅτι ἐκεῖνο[ι] ἐπεκάθισάν με ἐπὶ ἅ[ρ]ματος ἀνέμου καὶ εἰ[ς] τὰ πέρατα τῶν οὐρ[ανῶν] ἀνήνεγκαν. καὶ το[ὺς κό]σμους διεπεράσαμ[εν], τόν τε κόσμον [τοῦ θανά]του [καὶ κό]σμο[ν τοῦ σκό]τους καὶ τοῦ πυρὸς τὸν κόσμον. καὶ μετὰ ταῦτα εἰσῆξάν με εἰς κόσμον πλουσιώτατον ὅς εὐκλεέστατος μὲν τῷ φωτὶ ἐτύγχανεν, περικαλλέστερος δὲ ὧν εἶδον φωστήρων. πάντα δὲ ἐθεώρησεν καὶ ἐξήτασεν τοὺς ἀγγελους, καὶ εἴ τι αὐτῷ εἶπον, ἐνεχάραξεν αὐτοῦ ταῖς γραφαῖς.[1]

Translation

Moreover Enoch also speaks in a similar manner in his apocalypse: "I am Enoch the righteous. My sorrow was great, and a torrent of tears (streamed) from my eyes because I heard the insult which the wicked ones uttered."

He says: "While the tears were still in my eyes and the prayer was yet on my lips, I beheld approaching me s[even] angels descending from heaven. [Upon seeing] them I was so moved by fear that my knees began knocking."

He says moreover: "One of the angels, whose name was Michael, said to me: 'I was sent to you for this purpose—in order that I might show you all the deeds and reveal to you the place (appointed) for the pious, and to show you the place (appointed) for the impious and what sort of place of punishment the lawless are experiencing.'"

He says also: "They seated me upon a chariot of wind and brought me to the ends of the heavens. We traversed worlds—the world of [dea]th, the world of [dar]kness, and the world of fire. And after these (worlds) they brought me into a world of extraordinary richness which was resplendently luminous, even more beautiful than the heavenly luminaries which I (also) beheld."

All these things he saw, and he questioned the angels, and that which they told him he recorded in his writings.

Commentary

πάλιν καὶ ὁ Ἐνὼχ τοῦτον τὸν τπόπον ἔφη ἐν τῇ αὐτοῦ ἀποκαλύψει "Moreover Enoch also speaks in a similar manner in his 'apocalypse.'" Greek πάλιν presumably renders Syriac ܬܘܒ "again, once more." It is unclear whether the reference to Enoch's "apocalypse" signals a familiar title for a literary work attributed to that patriarch, or simply refers to a recorded experience contained within the larger Enochic corpus. The citations which follow are unattested in their present form among the surviving books of Enoch. An "Apocalypse of Enoch" is mentioned in later Syriac literature, but it appears to have no connection with the text(s) quoted here. Michael Syrus reports that two individuals named Cyriacus of Segestan and Bar Salta of Resh'ayna "composed a book of lies and named it 'apocalypse of Enoch' ...," using their forgery as a political tract against the final Umayyad caliph, Marwan II.[2] No portions of this latter work appear to have survived. Another missing text which may have been Enochic in ascription is signaled by S. Hopkins, who calls attention to the now empty folder that once contained T-S A45.1 and an early archivist's notation which reads ? ספרא דאדם או חנוך, followed by the English qualifier "important."[3]

ἐγώ εἰμι Ἐνὼχ ὁ δίκαιος "I am Enoch the righteous." The epithet δίκαιος, corresponding to Hebrew צדיק and Aramaic קשיט, is a standard appellation for Enoch in extant Enochic and cognate literature.[4] It is featured already in the Greek[5] and Ethiopic versions of *1 Enoch* 1:2, and thus one can confidently presume it was present in the Aramaic substrate underlying the later versions. *1 Enoch* 1:2b reads: ἄνθρωπος δίκαιός ἐστιν, [ᾧ] ὅρασις ἐκ θεοῦ αὐτῷ ἀνεῳγμένη ἦν ... "he is a righteous man to whom was revealed (lit. 'opened') a vision from God ...," the designation "righteous man" referring back to Enoch. Note also the prologue to the so-called "short version" of *2 Enoch*: "From the secret book(s) about the taking away of *Enoch the just* ...," the Slavonic word rendered "just" being surely a translation of Greek δίκαιος.[6]

The same epithet figures prominently in references to this forefather within the manuscript tradition of the *Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs*, as in *T. Levi* 10:5 (καθὼς περιέχει βίβλος *Ἐνὼχ τοῦ δικαίου*), *T. Judah* 18:1 (ὅτι καίγε ἀνέγνων ἐν βίβλοις *Ἐνὼχ τοῦ δικαίου* ὅσα κακὰ ποιήσετε ἐν ἐσχάταις ἡμέραις), and *T. Dan* 5:6 (ἀνέγνων γὰρ ἐν βίβλῳ *Ἐνὼχ τοῦ δικαίου* ...).[7]

The association of this designation with Enoch is also attested, albeit negatively, by another series of citations which criticize the lofty position this forefather achieves among those circles of scribes who produced Enochic and related works. The first evidence of this critique surfaces within the Greek translation of Sir 44:16, wherein Enoch is termed "an example of repentance for (future) generations."[8] His contrition would seem to presuppose sinful behavior that required forgiveness, a lifestyle that ill accords with the usual depiction of a "righteous" Enoch. No evidence for such behavior survives in either the Bible or Enochic texts. Nevertheless, a tradition similar to that reported in Sirach is found in Philo.[9] A further discordant note is sounded in Wis Sol 4:7, 10-11:

> *But the righteous*, though he die before his time, shall be at rest ...
> Being found well-pleasing unto God he was beloved of him,
> And while living among sinners he was translated:
> He was caught away, lest wickedness should change his understanding,
> Or guile deceive his soul.[10]

Verses 10-11 of this passage clearly allude to Enoch (compare LXX Gen 5:24) and evaluate him in terms that uncannily foreshadow subsequent rabbinic assessments of his status. Of signal importance for our present purposes is his invocation in verse 7 as "righteous" (δίκαιος). This suggests the language is intentional: the author of this passage mitigates, even denigrates, the epithet commonly applied by some of his contemporaries to the figure of Enoch.

Knowledge of the application of this epithet to Enoch is also demonstrated several centuries later in the critical attitudes of R. Hoshaya and R. Aibu preserved in *Gen. Rab.* 25.1: "'And Enoch walked with God ...' (Gen 5:24)—R. Hama in the name of R. Hoshaya said: He (i.e., Enoch) is not inscribed within the book *of the righteous*, but instead the book of the wicked. R. Aibu said: Enoch used to waver. *Sometimes he was righteous*, other times he was wicked. The Holy One thought: I will remove him (cf. Gen 5:24) *while he is righteous*."[11] The emphasis laid upon the attribute "righteous" in both instances would seem to reflect a polemical stance against its liberal application to the figure of Enoch in pseudepigraphical literature, as well as against the esteem Enoch enjoyed among certain groups of intellectuals and pietists.[12]

λύπη μοί ἐστιν μεγάλη[13] καὶ χύσις δακρύων ἐκ τῶν ὀφθαλμῶν μου διὰ τὸ ἀκηκοέναι με τὸν ὀνειδισμὸν τὸν προελθόντα ἐκ στόματος τῶν ἀ[σ]εβῶν "My sorrow was great, and a torrent of tears (streamed) from my eyes because I heard the insult which the wicked ones uttered." Comparable statements can be found in Tob 3:6 (ὅτι ὀνειδισμοὺς ψευδεῖς ἤκουσα, καὶ λύπη ἐστιν πολλὴ ἐν ἐμοί) and *T. Judah* 23:1 (πολλὴ δὲ λύπη μοί ἐστι, τέκνα μου, διὰ τὰς ἀσελγείας

κ.τ.λ.). While the settings for these statements vary, an examination of their contexts may prove instructive for recovering the background of the Enochic quote. The passage in Tobit occurs within a prayer, while the citation from *T. Judah* introduces an oracle of the patriarch directed against his erring descendants. Either narrative setting is appropriate for Enoch as a developed literary character within the extant Enochic corpus: he frequently prays (see the section following this one), and is popularly recognized as possessing foreknowledge of future events. Our present passage deliberately combines aspects of both activities. Note the wording of what occurs after our passage: "while the tears were still in my eyes and the prayer was yet on my lips, I beheld ...," a statement that connects the eventual angelophany with whatever setting is presupposed here. Therefore the redactor of this section of the *Codex* intends for the reader to interpret Enoch's experiences as a logical narrative progression: he overhears the impious calumny, he weeps, he prays, and is granted a consolatory vision. There is thus only one setting for the entire pericope. However, one need not draw the conclusion that the scene was constructed in the same way within the underlying Enochic source. Rather, there appears to be some suggestive evidence that the Enochic "experience" recounted here was built from smaller units of tradition culled from a variety of sources.

If we temporarily bracket the urge (encouraged by the redactor) to treat Enoch's speech as if it were prayer, and reconsider its semantic thrust in isolation from the following material, it seems to express an emotional reaction to certain habits of speech or behavior which the speaker viewed with dismay. It is thus formally similar to the passage cited above from *T. Judah* 23:1. In that latter citation, Judah expresses his disappointment and sorrow over the licentious behavior of a number of his descendants, and goes on to predict a disastrous fate for his straying "children." Similarly, Enoch's distress is provoked by certain impudent or offensive language that is uttered by a group of individuals termed ἀσεβεῖς "wicked ones" (Hebrew **רשעים**). Who were these boastful miscreants? Remaining within the context of Enochic literature, one immediately thinks of the latter part of *1 Enoch* 1:9: ὅτι ἔρχεται σὺν ταῖς μυριάσιν αὐτοῦ καὶ τοῖς ἁγίοις αὐτοῦ, ποιῆσαι κρίσιν κατὰ πάντων, *καὶ ἀπολέσει πάντας τοὺς ἀσεβεῖς*, καὶ ἐλέγξει πᾶσαν σάρκα περὶ πάντων ἔργων τῆς ἀσεβείας αὐτῶν ὧν ἠσέβησαν *καὶ σκληρῶν ὧν ἐλάλησαν λόγων ... κατ' αὐτοῦ ἁμαρτωλοὶ ἀσεβεῖς* "when He comes with His myriads and His holy ones to judge all things, and *He will destroy all the wicked ones*, and reprove all flesh in accordance with all the wicked deeds which they committed, *and all the hard words which the sinful wicked ones uttered against Him.*" Here the "wicked ones" (identified as ἀσεβεῖς) not only provoke God by their corrupt behavior, but also incur blame due to certain "hard words" (σκληρῶν ... λόγων)[14] which they have spoken against Him. Similarly Enoch overhears a blasphemous "reproach" or "insult" (ὀνειδισμός) emanating from the mouths of the "wicked ones," although in Enoch's case it remains unclear whether God, Enoch himself, or someone else is the target of the insult. The narrative context of *1 Enoch* 1:9, however, renders it unlikely that the scene described there takes place during the "lifetime" of Enoch. *1 Enoch* 1:9 focuses upon the eschaton: the "wicked ones" there are not contemporaries of the seer, but the final generations who will experience reward and punishment (as the case might be) at the End of Days. This finds clear expression in *1 Enoch* 1:2: καὶ οὐκ εἰς τὴν νῦν γενεὰν διενοούμην, ἀλλὰ ἐπὶ πόρρω οὖσαν ἐγὼ λαλῶ "and not for the present generation do I intend (my words), but rather for a distant one do I speak."[15] However, the situation presupposed in our present fragment is contemporaneous with Enoch. What can be said about the possible identity of these "wicked ones"?

Worthy candidates for this distinctive appellation are members of the infamous "generation of the Flood" (**דור המבול**). Textual warrant for that generation's labelling as ἀσεβεῖς occurs in 2 Pet 2:5.[16] Moreover another consideration, primarily interpretive in nature, strengthens this possible identification. An ancient exegetical tradition keys the speech uttered by Job in Job 21:7-15 to events that transpired during the final years of the antediluvian era.[17] Therein we read:

מדוע רשעים יחיו עתקו גם גברו חיל
זרעם נכון לפניהם עמם וצאצאיהם לעיניהם
בתיהם שלום מפחד ולא שבט אלוה עליהם
שורו עבר ולא יגעל תפלט פרתו ולא תשכל
ישלחו כצאן עוליהם וילדיהם ירקדון
ישאו כתף וכנור וישמחו לקול עוגב
יבלו בטוב ימיהם וברגע שאול יחתו
ויאמרו לאל סור ממנו ודעת דרכיך לא חפצנו
מה שדי כי נעבדנו ומה נועיל כי נפגע בו

Why do the wicked live on,
Prosper and grow wealthy?
Their children are with them always,
And they see their children's children.
Their homes are secure, without fear;
They do not feel the rod of God.
Their bull breeds and does not fail;
Their cow calves and never miscarries;
They let their infants run loose like sheep,
And their children skip about.
They sing to the music of timbrel and lute,
And revel to the tune of the pipe;
They spend their days in happiness,
And go down to Sheol in peace.
They say to God, 'Leave us alone,
We do not want to learn your ways;
What is Shaddai that we should serve Him?
What will we gain by praying to Him?'[18]

According to this popular interpretation, Job 21:7-15 preserves an "historical" reminiscence of certain typical events, actions, and utterances associated with the Flood generation. The genesis of this exegetical insight should probably be traced to the characterization of this group as רשעים in verse 7.[19] Having secured this identification, then the specific actions or events depicted in the text suggest aspects of the behavior or customs of that generation. Thus, for example, in a curious tradition recounting the behavior of the offspring of the most prominent members of that wicked generation, the angelic Watchers and their mortal wives, R. Levi states: "They engendered their offspring, and they multiplied like some kind of giant reptile—six (being born) at every birth. Immediately upon birth they would stand up upon their feet and speak Hebrew *and cavort before them [their parents] like lambs* (ומרקדין לפניהם כצאן)."[20] The emphasized portion of this passage need not reflect the tradent's reliance upon some apocryphal literary source for this information. Its very wording invokes Job 21:11 as its inspiration: "they let their infants run loose *like sheep, and their children skip about* (ישלחו כצאן עוליהם וילדיהם ירקדון)."

Especial attention should however be directed to Job 21:14-15. Whereas the preceding verses depict certain activities or events, these final two verses reproduce a retort which, from the point of view of the ancient interpreters, emanated from the mouths of the Flood generation. "Leave us alone," they said, "we do not want to learn Your ways: What is Shaddai that we should serve Him? What will we gain by praying to Him?" It is clear from the wording of this utterance that it is directed at God Himself, thus constituting a blasphemous rejection of divine governance and guidance. Here, it seems, is a perfect example of the type of ὀνειδισμός which would sadden a remonstrative Enoch. It thus seems plausible to interpret our Manichaean Enochic fragment in the light of this Jewish exegetical tradition. Whoever composed this particular extract was cognizant of a tradition wherein the wicked members of the Flood generation verbally reject God.

Interestingly the author of the so-called *3 Enoch* confirms the relevance of this exegetical tradition within Enochic lore. In *3 Enoch* 4, R. Ishmael asks Metatron why the latter is addressed by lesser angelic entities as "Youth" (נער) ? Metatron responds: "Because I am (actually) Enoch b. Yared. When the Flood-generation acted sinfully and committed corrupt deeds *and said to God, 'Depart from us!'*, as it is written, 'They say to God: Leave us alone! We do not want to learn Your ways!' (Job 21:14), God took me from among them to be a witness against them in the high heavens ...."[21] This passage cements the textual identification of the ὀνειδισμός with Job 21:14-15, and explicitly connects it with an event witnessed by the earth-bound Enoch.

ἔλεγεν δὲ [ὅ]τι τῶν δακρύων ἐν [τοῖ]ς ὀφθαλμοῖς μου ὄν[των] καὶ δεήσεως ἐν τῷ [στό]ματι ἐθεώρησα ἐπι[στάν]τας μοι ἀγγελους ἑ[πτὰ ἐκ το]ῦ οὐρανοῦ κα[τερχομέ]νου[ς.] "He says: 'While the tears were still in my eyes and the prayer was yet on my lips, I beheld approaching me s[even] angels descending from heaven.'" The incipit ἔλεγεν δὲ [ὅ]τι apparently signals a redactional seam, suggesting that the quotation which follows derives from a different Enochic

document or pericope. This supposition receives some support from the manuscript itself: a *vacat* separates the present citation from the one that immediately preceded it. Nevertheless, a shared motif—that of "weeping"—effectively establishes a narrative linkage between these two originally disparate settings.

Here Enoch's tears and prayer provoke a response from heaven in the form of an angelophany. Interestingly, a similar conjunction of weeping and revelatory event is found at the beginning of *2 Enoch*. Therein we read: "I [Enoch] was in my house alone, *weeping and grieving with my eyes*. When I had lain down on my bed, I fell asleep. And two huge men appeared to me, the like of which I had never seen on earth ... And the men said to me, 'Be brave, Enoch! Do not fear! The eternal Lord has sent us to you. And behold, today you will ascend with us to heaven.'"[22] While these two Enochic passages are not duplicates, there exists sufficient similarity to posit their common origin from an earlier source, if not a reliance of one upon the other.[23] Prayer coordinated with weeping that leads to an angelophany is also a sequence prominent in certain apocalyptic traditions.[24] Moshe Idel has plausibly suggested that a seer's "weeping" should be viewed as a species of mystical technique that induces an altered state of consciousness or a theophany, compiling in the process of his investigation an impressive list of instances wherein this motif occurs.[25] Our Enochic fragment would seem to supply another example of this phenomenon.

Seven angels descend from heaven in response to Enoch's "summons." Since one of them bears the name "Michael" (as we learn later in this same [?] fragment), these seven are presumably to be identified with those pre-eminent members of the angelic class usually termed "archangels." While some sources suggest a cosmological system that employs only four archangels,[26] the most popular arrangement envisions a scheme whereby seven of these beings assist God in His management of the universe. It has been suggested that the popularity of the latter enumeration reflects the influence of Babylonian astral conceptions: the seven archangels derive from the deities associated with the seven planets of Babylonian astronomy.[27]

However, one need not appeal to Mesopotamian ancestry[28] for the origin of this particular idea. There is already biblical precedent for the concept of seven divine emissaries. In Ezek 9:1-2 we read: ויקרא באזני קול גדול לאמר קרבו פקדות העיר ואיש כלי משחתו בידו והנה ששה אנשים באים מדרך שער העליון אשר מפנה צפונה ואיש כלי מפצו בידו ואיש אחד בתוכם לבוש בדים וקסת הספר במתניו ויבאו ויעמדו אצל מזבח הנחשת "Then He called loudly in my hearing, saying, 'Approach, you men in charge of the city, each bearing his weapons of destruction!' And *six men* entered by way of the upper gate that faces north, each with his club in his hand; and among them was *another*, clothed in linen, with a writing case at his waist. They came forward and stopped at the bronze altar."[29] While these seven agents are not termed "angels" or even "archangels," they are traditionally understood to be identical with such entities.[30] The version of *Targum Jonathan* preserved in Codex Reuchlinianus[31] renders Hebrew אנשים of Ezek 9:2 as מלאכיא מחבליא בדמות גברין "angels of destruction in human form." *B. Šabb.* 55a identifies the איש לבוש הבדים as the archangel Gabriel:

although it is not explicitly stated there, it seems reasonable to conclude that the remaining six figures are his fellow archangels.

References to seven archangels occur in a variety of literary sources,[32] including perhaps most importantly certain texts belonging to Enochic tradition. In the so-called "Animal Apocalypse" (*1 Enoch* 85-90), Enoch is portrayed observing *seven* "white men" who descend from heaven to inflict punishment upon the wicked generation of the Flood (*1 Enoch* 87:2). A previous version of this same legend mentioned only four punitive agents (*1 Enoch* 9-10). A little later in the "Animal Apocalypse" we read: "and the Lord called those men, *the seven first white ones*, and commanded (them) to bring before him the first star which went before those stars ... and he said to that man who wrote before him, *who was one of the seven white ones*—he said to him: 'Take those seventy shepherds ...'" (*1 Enoch* 90:21-22).[33] These two verses betray a dependence upon Ezek 9:1-2: the angel who serves in a scribal capacity is apparently identical with the authoritative recording angel of the biblical source. Moreover, Ezek 9:1-2 also supplies one reason for the Enochic emissaries' distinctive white garb.[34] The clothing of the chief angel in Ezekiel (**לבוש בדים**), "clothed in *white* linen," is now worn by each of the Enochic messengers. Enoch perceives them as "white" because they are wearing this distinctive garment. Note too the experience described by Levi in *T. Levi* 8:1ff. Therein we read: κἀκεῖ πάλιν εἶδον πρᾶγμα ὥσπερ τὸ πρότερον, μετὰ τὸ ποιῆσαι ἡμέρας ἑβδομήκοντα. *καὶ εἶδον ἑπτὰ ἀνθρώπους ἐν ἐσθῆτι λευκῇ*, λέγοντάς μοι· ἀναστὰς .. "and after we had been there seventy days, I had another vision just as I had had before. *And I saw seven men clothed in white* saying to me, Get up ...."[35] This latter passage displays an obvious dependence upon this same interpretive trajectory.

Seven archangels also appear in the duplicate Greek versions of *1 Enoch* 20:1-7.[36] In this passage the names and duties of the angels are specified,[37] and the pericope concludes with the summary statement ἀρχαγγέλων ὀνόματα ἑπτά. 4QShirShabb mentions seven **נשיאי רוש**,[38] who are presumably equivalent to the seven archangels. Finally, the so-called *3 Enoch* is conversant with the same scheme: **אמר ר' ישמעאל אמר לי מטטרון מלאך שר הפנים הדר מרום כל שבעה הם שרים הגדולים נאים נוראים נפלאים נכבדים שהם ממונים בשבעה רקיעים ואלו הן ... מיכאל גבריאל שחקיאל ברדיאל ברקיאל סדריאל** "R. Ishmael said: Meṭaṭron, angelic prince of the Divine Presence (who is) the glory of the (heavenly) heights, said to me: There are seven great, beautiful, awesome, wonderful, and honored princes who are appointed over the seven heavens; namely, Michael, Gabriel, Šatqi'el, Šaḥaqi'el, Baradi'el, Baraqi'el, and Sidri'el ...."[39] This *Hekhalot* text displays a greater cosmological sophistication than the earlier Enochic literature, but a total of seven pre-eminent angelic entities, despite differences in their individual identification, remain visible. Our Enochic fragment thus belongs among those texts that bear witness to the popularity of a seven-archangel scheme.

[ἰδὼν δὲ] αὐτοὺς ἐκινήθην ὑπὸ δέους ὥστε τὰ γόνατά μου ἀλλήλοις προσαράσσειν "[Upon seeing] them I was so moved by fear that my knees began knocking." The angelophany provokes an emotional reaction in Enoch that physically manifests itself in an involuntary shuddering or quaking of the joints—a "knocking of the knees." Similar physical responses to a supernatural visit are recorded in the accompanying pseudepigraphical fragments, but this is the only instance wherein this specific reflex occurs. One is reminded of Daniel 5 and the infamous banquet of Belshazzar. There, as the festivities progress, a disembodied hand suddenly appears and inscribes mysterious signs upon the wall of the banquet chamber. When the king beheld this bizarre sight, "his face changed color, his reason departed, the joints of his loins were loosened, *and his knees knocked one against the other* (**וארכבתה דא לדא נקשן**) " (Dan 5:6). One might also note Dan 10:10-11: "Then a hand touched me, and shook me onto my hands and knees ... After he said this to me, I stood up, trembling."[40]

καὶ πάλιν εἶπεν οὕτως· ἔφη μοι εἷς τῶν ἀγγέλων Μιχαὴλ τοὔνομα· "He says moreover: One of the angels, whose name was Michael, said to me ...." As suggested above, the use of a phrase like καὶ πάλιν εἶπεν οὕτως indicates an editorial seam where originally disparate Enochic texts have been artificially joined by the redactor of this portion of the *Codex*. This instance of narrative splicing is effected via the shared angelophanic setting of the two smaller fragments. Seven unnamed angels figure in the preceding fragment; in the present passage one of these entities is designated as Michael, although in the speech that is attributed to him reference is never made to his putative archangelic colleagues. He instead speaks as if he were the only messenger present: "*I* was sent to you for this purpose—in order that *I* might show you all the deeds, etc." Apparently two separate visions were combined, one of which featured seven anonymous angels (à la *T. Levi* 8), and the other of which featured Enoch's encounter with the lone archangel Michael.

The explicit naming of individual archangelic entities occurs only twice in the pseudepigraphic fragments we are examining in the present study. The figure of Balsamos in the Adam citation remains somewhat enigmatic to modern scholars, but the same cannot be said about the appearance of Michael here, for the latter's importance is well attested within Jewish tradition. He already functions within the biblical book of Daniel as the heavenly guardian of the nation of Israel (Dan 10:13, 21; 12:1). The Qumran *War Scroll* exhibits a similar understanding of Michael's patronage: **וישלח עזר עולמים לגורל [פ]דותו בגבורת מלאך האדיר למשרת מיכאל באור עולמים להאיר בשמחה ב[ית י]שראל שלום וברכה לגורל אל להרים באלים משרת מיכאל וממשלת ישראל בכול בשר** "and He will send eternal succour to the company of His redeemed by the might of the princely Angel of the kingdom of Michael. With everlasting light He will enlighten with joy [the children] of Israel; peace and blessing shall be with the company of God. He will raise up the kingdom of Michael in the midst of the gods, and the realm of Israel in the midst of all flesh" (1QM 17:6-7).[41]

This martial aspect of Michael's archangelic duties finds little discernible echo in the extant Enochic literature.[42] Instead, his primary function there seems to be revelatory.[43] When Enoch tours the cosmos (as described in *1 Enoch* 21-36), Michael identifies the Tree of Life for him and reveals to him

the joys of the righteous at the End of Days (*1 Enoch* 24:6-25:7). Later Michael discourses with Noah about the coming day of judgment; i.e. the Deluge (*1 Enoch* 60:4-6). But perhaps the most pertinent episode(s) with regard to our present fragment can be found in *1 Enoch* 70-71, the concluding chapters of the third discrete section of *1 Enoch* termed the "Similitudes" (*1 Enoch* 37-71). Several items featured in these final two chapters deserve closer scrutiny, and shall be discussed in more detail below.

Incidentally, the name of Michael (alongside those of Gabriel, Raphael, and Sariel) appears in several medieval Middle Iranian Manichaean manuscripts recovered from central Asia during the first decades of the present century.[44] These texts, either hymnic or incantational in genre, generally exhibit a close relationship to the Aramaic incantation bowls produced by various Mesopotamian religious communities in late antiquity,[45] thereby attesting a Manichaean interest and presence in that cultural symbiosis.[46] Nevertheless, the Manichaean focus upon precisely these four entities suggests that it was Enochic literature, particularly that manifested in *1 Enoch* 6-16 and the Book of Giants, that is largely responsible for the transmission of these specific archangelic names to Manichaean communities. It is surely suggestive that Sariel's status as one of God's four principal archangels is found only in the original Aramaic version of *1 Enoch* 9:1,[47] the Qumran *War Scroll* (1QM 9:14-16),[48] and these Manichaean fragments.[49]

τούτου χάριν πρὸς σὲ ἀπεστάλην ἵνα ὑποδείξωμέν σοι πάντα τὰ ἔργα καὶ ἀποκαλύψωμέν σοι τὸν τῶν εὐσεβῶν χῶρον καὶ χῶρον σοι δείξω τὸν τῶ[ν] δυσσεβῶν καὶ ὁποῖος τυγχάνει ὁ τῆς τιμωρίας τῶν ἀνόμων τόπος "I was sent to you for this purpose—in order that I might show you all the deeds and reveal to you the place (appointed) for the pious, and to show you the place (appointed) for the impious and what sort of place of punishment the lawless are experiencing." Greek τούτου χάριν perhaps reflects ܥܠ ܗܕܐ or ܥܠ ܗܠܝ, as in Titus 1:5 (τούτου χάριν ἀπέλιπόν σε ἐν Κρήτῃ ... = Peshitta ܥܠ ܗܕܐ ...). One might compare the clause announcing the purpose of the angelophany experienced by Isaiah in *Asc. Isa.* 7:5, 8: "But in the place where I am to take you, you will see a vision, *for I have been sent for this very purpose*[50] ... *for I have been sent* from the seventh heaven *to explain* all this to you."[51] For the places visited by Enoch during his tour, see the discussion below.

φησὶ δὲ πάλιν ὅτι ἐκεῖνο[ι] ἐπεκάθισάν με ἐπι ἅ[ρ]ματος ἀνέμου καὶ εἰ[ς] τὰ πέρατα τῶν οὐρ[ανῶν] ἀνήνεγκαν "He says also: 'They seated me upon a chariot of wind and brought me to the ends of the heavens.'" Enoch's mode of travel to the supernal regions, a "chariot of wind" (ἅρματος ἀνέμου), is identical to that found in *1 Enoch* 70:2: *wa-tala"ala ba-saragalā*[52] *manfas wa-waḏ'a sem ba-mā'kalomu* "he ascended on a chariot of wind, and (his) name disappeared from among them."[53] The choice of this particular type of conveyance interweaves several traditional motifs. According to *1 Enoch* 14:8, Enoch ascends to heaven through the agency of "winds."[54] *1 Enoch* 39:3 and 52:1 also explicitly refer to his wind-driven voyage(s).[55] The ultimate source of

this imagery would appear to be the biblical account of the ascension of Elijah, which already combines the motifs of "chariot" and "whirlwind," found in 2 Kgs 2:11: והנה רכב אש וסוסי אש ויפרדו בין שניהם ויעל אליהו בסערה השמים "a fiery *chariot* with fiery horses suddenly appeared and separated one from the other [i.e., Elijah from Elisha]; and Elijah *went up to heaven in a whirlwind*" (NJPS). Another text featuring a similar collocation of media is *Adam and Eve* 25:2-3: "When we were at prayer, Michael the archangel, a messenger of God, came to me. And I saw *a chariot like the wind*, and its wheels were fiery; and I was caught up into the Paradise of righteousness."[56] In this latter passage the imagery of Ezekiel 1 discernibly augments the older tradition associated with Elijah. A final text to note is *3 Enoch* 7: אמר לי מטטרון מלאך שר הפנים כשלקחני ה״ב״ה״ מן בני דור המבול העלני בכנפי רוח שכינה לרקיע העליון "Metatron said to me: 'When the Holy One, blessed be He, removed me from the Flood generation, he bore me up on the wings of the wind[57] of the Shekinah to the highest heaven."[58]

The expression "ends of the heavens" (τὰ πέρατα τῶν οὐρανῶν) corresponds to Aramaic קצות שמיא.[59] Interestingly, this phrase occurs in *1 Enoch* 71:3-4, a narrative text and context that shares some common elements with our Manichaean fragment. Therein we read:

> And *Michael*, an angel, *one of the chief angels*, grasped me by my right hand, and *lifted me up* and led me to where all secrets (are), and he revealed to me all the secrets of mercy and he revealed to me all the secrets of justice. And he revealed to me all the secrets of *the ends of heaven*, and all the chambers of the stars, and *all of the luminaries*, from where they go forth to the presence of the holy ones.[60]

I have underscored several explicit correspondences linking *1 Enoch* 71:3-4 and our Manichaean fragment: Enoch's heavenly voyage, the archangel Michael as revelatory agent and tour guide, a reference to the expression "ends of (the) heaven(s)," even though its precise significance differs in each text,[61] and the heavenly luminaries (i.e., sun, moon, planets) as one of the featured sights of his tour (see below). One might possibly contend there are further implicit parallels as well. The "secrets of mercy" and the "secrets of justice" which Enoch beholds in verse 3b above—conveniently unqualified as to their nature—can easily be interpreted as a reference to the manner in which and the locales where God "mercifully" rewards the righteous and "justly" punishes the wicked in the world to come.[62] Compare, for example, the strikingly similar Enochic ascent-experience that is depicted in *1 Enoch* 39:3ff., especially verses 3-5: "And at that time clouds and a storm-wind carried me off from the face of the earth, and set me down at the end of heaven. And there I saw another vision, the dwelling of the righteous and the resting-places of the holy. There my eyes saw their dwelling with the angels and their resting-places with the holy ones ...."[63] In this passage Enoch's mode of travel and his destination roughly parallel what is found in *1 Enoch* 70-71, but in place of the generic statements of 71:3 ("all the secrets of mercy," "all the secrets of justice") we receive more specific information regarding what Enoch is shown; *viz.*, the locales inhabited by the pious in the afterlife. One is tempted to argue that 39:4-5 deliberately interprets some of the ambiguous

language of 71:3, particularly the significance of "secrets of mercy."[64] Further on, during the same ascent-experience, the "secrets of justice" are also explained: "There I saw the dwelling of the chosen and the resting-places of the holy; and my eyes saw there *all the sinners* who deny the name of the Lord of Spirits being driven from there, and they *dragged them off*, and they were not able to remain because of *the punishment* which went out from the Lord of Spirits" (*1 Enoch* 41:2).[65]

A similar interpretation (adaptation?) of *1 Enoch* 71:3 apparently occurs in the Manichaean fragment.[66] Therein Michael shows Enoch "the place for the pious" (τὸν τῶν εὐσεβῶν χῶρον) and "the place for the impious and what sort of place of punishment the lawless are experiencing" (χῶρον ... τὸν τῶ[ν] δυσσεβῶν καὶ ὁποῖος τυγχάνει ὁ τῆς τιμωρίας τῶν ἀνόμων τόπος), more detailed descriptions of which now follow.

καὶ το[ὺς κό]σμους διεπεράσαμ[εν], τόν τε κόσμον [τοῦ θανά]του [καὶ κό]σμο[ν τοῦ σκό]τους καὶ τοῦ πυρὸς τὸν κόσμον "We traversed worlds—the world of [dea]th, the world of [dar]kness, and the world of fire." Enoch's itinerary consists of four "worlds" (κόσμοι) or "realms": three with negative connotations, presumably serving as places for the punishment of the "impious" mentioned above, and one of positive significance, apparently the locale where the "pious" are rewarded, which will receive further attention below. This four-fold division of the world to come may be dependent upon the similar structuring of Sheol found in the Greek version of *1 Enoch* 22:2. There it states that Enoch viewed "four places" (τέσσαρες τόποι), further qualified with regard to their nature as "three ... dark and one bright" (τρεῖς αὐτῶν σκοτινοὶ καὶ εἷς φωτινός).[67]

The designations employed in our fragment for the various "worlds" (probably reflecting Syriac ܥܠܡܐ or ܡܬܐ) possess few analogues in the cognate literatures. The phrase "world of [dea]th" is a conjectural restoration by the *Codex* editors and hence open to emendation; nevertheless, one might compare Hebrew ארץ צלמות (Isa 9:1; Job 10:21), or Syriac ܐܪܥܐ ܕܛܠܡܐ[68] The expression "world of Darkness" (*alma d-hšuka*) occurs frequently in Mandaean texts as a designation for the evil principle of their dualistic system;[69] another popular term is *atra d-hšuka* "place (or domain) of Darkness."[70] Early Manichaeism sometimes refers to its evil principle as the "domain of Darkness" (ܫܘܟܐ ܕܐܬܪܐ),[71] and Theodore bar Konai's valuable eighth-century heresiological report identifies "world(s) of fire (and) darkness" among the five constituent Aeons of the "land of Darkness."[72] However, neither Mandaeism nor Manichaeism employ these phrases to indicate particular locations or to identify types of punishment within their respective underworlds; rather, these terms are used to denote one of the fundamental elements of the structure of reality itself.

"Fire" and "darkness" as complementary aspects of the present (and future) punishment of the wicked are well attested in Second Temple era and subsequent Jewish literature. *1 Enoch* 63:6 depicts fallen "rulers and mighty ones" as presently imprisoned in eternal "darkness,"[73] and *1 Enoch* 54:1-2 forecasts their eventual torment in "burning fire," a fate apparently modeled upon that of the rebellious angelic Watchers at the End of Days (cf. 54:5-6; 67:4-7—both of which betray dependence upon 10:4-6). One might note the suggestive language of *1 Enoch* 103:7-8: "Know (o sinners) that your souls will descend *into Sheol*, and there they will be in great distress—even in *darkness and bondage and burning flame*, and your souls shall come to the great judgment for all the generations of the world. Woe to you, for you shall have no peace."[74] Verse 8a, with its threefold specification of the sorts of punishment that will be endured in Sheol, might conceivably have served as the model for the three dolorous "worlds" of our Manichaean fragment. Compare also *2 Enoch* 5:11-13 (short version):

> And those men took me from there (Paradise, in the third heaven) and carried me up to the north of the heaven and showed me there a very terrible place. Every kind of torment and torture is in that place, and *darkness* and mist; and there is no light there, but a dark *fire* flaming up eternally[75] in that place, and a river of fire rising up against all that place. And there are cold and ice and *prisons* in that place, and fierce and cruel angels who carry weapons and inflict torments without mercy.[76]

The same three afflictions enumerated in *1 Enoch* 103:8 are present here also, suggesting that this Enochic roster of underworld *topoi* was viewed within certain scribal circles as normative. If this was indeed the case, perhaps a better restoration for the first κόσμος identified within our Manichaean fragment would be something like "world of bondage," "world of chains," or "world of imprisonment," instead of "world of [dea]th."

καὶ μετὰ ταῦτα εἰσῆξάν με εἰς κόσμον πλουσιώτατον ὃς εὐκλεέστατος μὲν τῷ φωτὶ ἐτύγχανεν, περικαλλέστερος δὲ ὧν εἶδον φωστήρων "And after these (worlds) they brought me into a world of extraordinary richness which was resplendently luminous, even more beautiful than the heavenly luminaries which I (also) beheld.'" Enoch's viewing of the luminaries also forms a part of his heavenly tour(s) in *1 Enoch* 39-41 (41:5-9) and 71 (verse 4), both of which share significant correspondences with the account narrated within the Manichaean fragment. According to *2 Enoch* 6 (short version), immediately after beholding Paradise and Gehenna in the third heaven, Enoch ascends to the fourth heaven where he observes the heavenly luminaries and their movements.

The radiant character of the paradaisal "world" viewed by Enoch is another motif that is well attested in Jewish sources,[77] not the least among which are Enochic works. As we have seen, *1 Enoch* 22:2, a probable sources for this section of our fragment, speaks of three "dark" sections and one "bright" (φωτινός) section within Sheol. According to 22:9, its brilliance stems from a "luminous spring of water" located there.[78] *1 Enoch* 58:2-6 describes the future blessed state of the righteous using imagery that relies heavily upon the vocabulary of incandescence:

> Blessed are you, the righteous and chosen, for your lot will be glorious! And the righteous will be in the light of the sun, and the chosen in the light of eternal life; and there will be no end to the days of their life, and the days of the holy

> will be without number. And they will seek the light, and will find righteousness with the Lord of Spirits. Peace be to the righteous with the Lord of the world! And after this it will be said to the holy that they should seek in heaven the secrets of righteousness, the lot of faith; for it has become bright as the sun upon the dry ground, and darkness has passed away. And there will be ceaseless light,[79] and to a limit of days they will not come, for darkness will have been destroyed previously; and the light will endure before the Lord of Spirits, and the light of uprightness will endure before the Lord of Spirits for ever.[80]

Or compare *1 Enoch* 108:11-15:

> And now I will call the spirits of the good who are of the generation of light, and I will transform those who were born in darkness, who in the flesh were not recompensed with honour, as was fitting to their faith. And I will bring out into shining light those who love my holy name, and I will set each one on the throne of his honour. And they will shine for times without number, for righteousness is the judgement of God, for with the faithful he will keep faith in the dwelling of upright paths. And they will see those who were born in darkness thrown into darkness, while the righteous shine. And the sinners will cry out as they see them shining, but they themselves will go where days and times have been written down for them.[81]

2 Enoch 13:27 (short version) states: "And from there I went up into the Paradise of the righteous; and I saw there a blessed place, and every creature is blessed, and all live in joy and gladness, *and in measureless light*, and in eternal life."[82]

With regard to the "rich" character of the paradaisal world, one should note *Odes Sol.* 11:16: "His Paradise wherein is the wealth (ܥܘܬܪܐ) of the Lord's pleasure."[83] The association of this concept with the supernal regions invokes comparisons with the Mandaean concept of the heavenly World of Light, among whose populace are an innumerable series of spiritual entities termed *'uthras*.

πάντα δὲ ἐθεώρησεν καὶ ἐξήτασεν τοὺς ἀγγελους, καὶ εἴ τι αὐτῷ εἶπον, ἐνεχάραξεν αὐτοῦ ταῖς γραφαῖς "All these things he saw, and he questioned the angels, and that which they told him he recorded in his writings." Legends regarding Enoch's heavenly education and the "books" ("writings," "scrolls," etc.) that result from his experience(s) abound in ancient and even medieval literature.[84] There are numerous references within the extant text of *1 Enoch* itself to "a plurality of [Enochic] books."[85] The original version of *1 Enoch* 106:19 preserves a direct reference to his angelic instructors: "I know the mysteries ... the Holy Ones have informed me and shown me."[86] Compare as well *1 Enoch* 1:2: "... And I heard everything from them [the angels], and I understood what I saw ...,"[87] the latter clause perhaps presupposing an interrogation of the angels by the forefather. Note also *Jub.* 4:17-24, especially verse 21: "And he was with *the angels* of God these six jubilees of years, and *they showed him* everything on earth and in the heavens, and the power of the sun; and *he wrote down everything*."[88]

Synthesis

The Manichaean "apocalypse of Enoch" is clearly a composite work that has been pieced together from textual traditions, motifs, and patterns found within the surviving Enochic corpus of writings; *viz.*, the Ethiopic and Slavonic books of *Enoch*.[89] Our analysis indicates that the "apocalypse" is heavily reliant upon *1 Enoch*, and appears to be cognizant of at least four of the five classically recognized components of that work.[90] Furthermore, the "apocalypse" also exhibits closer agreement (where evidence is extant; see above) with the Aramaic *Vorlage* of *1 Enoch* than with the subsequent Greek and Ethiopic versions. These considerations suggest that the Manichaean employment of *1 Enoch* (and related literature, such as the *Book of Giants*) goes back to the earliest Mesopotamian stages of the group's formation, perhaps as far back as the creative activity of Mani himself. A question that remains is whether the citations of the "apocalypse" formed part of the original Aramaic *Grundschrift* of the *CMC*, or whether they were added from a secondary compilation of Enochic works by a later redactor, such as Baraies.

At any rate, a particularly intriguing result of our examination is the discernible influence of material now found only in the Similitudes of Enoch (*1 Enoch* 37-71) on the "apocalypse." It is of course widely recognized that to date there is no textual evidence for the existence of the Similitudes prior to the preparation of the Ethiopic version of *1 Enoch*, which took place presumably during the fifth or sixth centuries CE. No trace of this material survives at Qumran, nor is it ever quoted in those ancient sources that preserve remnants of Enochic literature.[91] Nevertheless, the connections between what is recounted in the "apocalypse" and certain contents of the Similitudes, particularly the angelophany of *1 Enoch* 70-71, are so intimate that we can hardly deem them coincidental. Some fresh consideration should thus be given to the vexed question of the date and provenance of the Similitudes of Enoch.

Much has been written on the relationship of the Similitudes to the other component "books" of *1 Enoch*, but little has been resolved or greeted with widespread endorsement. The Similitudes is formally distinguished by its structure and phraseology. It consists of three visions, each termed "similitude" (*messālē*), symmetrically framed by introductory and concluding (some would say two concluding) narrative brackets. God is almost always designated by the epithet "Lord of Spirits,"[92] and frequent reference is made to a heavenly entity termed "Son of Man" (alternatively, the "Elect One"). This latter circumstance has led some to argue a Christian provenance for the Similitudes; less radically, many others have opted to view the "Son of Man" motif as an essential source for interpreting New Testament gospel usage of the concept. The Similitudes as we have them (in Ethiopic) have

clearly been translated from an earlier version, and arguments have been advanced espousing the relative merits of a Hebrew, Aramaic, or even Greek archetype. At present, the weight of evidence seems to favor an Aramaic *Vorlage*.[93]

The original date of composition has proved to be a most troublesome problem, aggravated largely by the lack of external attestation and by the use of a visionary genre. Some commentators seize upon 56:5-7, with its mention of a Parthian invasion of "the land of the elect ones," as possible evidence for the historical locus of the Similitudes. Parthian incursions, or at least threats of such, associated with the years 40 BCE,[94] 115-117 CE,[95] and even 250-270 CE (!)[96] have each received eloquent advocacy from their respective proponents. However, the symbolic character of this genre of literature dictates that attempts to ground its rhetoric within actual events are ultimately fruitless and doomed to failure. The language is formulaic and projective, and is not descriptive of historical occurrences. The phrase "Parthians and Medes" refers to an eschatological adversary of the Gog ha-Magog type.[97] Nevertheless, the choice of national identity for this enemy does indicate a setting during the era of Roman domination (i.e., post-63 BCE), a time when the Parthians and eventually their Sasanian heirs represented the only plausible threats to Roman hegemony in the Near East.[98]

If the "apocalypse" is indeed dependent upon passages found only in the Similitudes of Enoch, we have then conclusive textual evidence for the existence of part or all of the Similitudes prior to the middle of the first millennium CE, and more importantly, for the existence of this material prior to its inheritance and adaptation by nascent Manichaeism.[99] This evidence serves to confirm those hypotheses that view the Similitudes as a product of the first or early second centuries CE, authored by one or more circles possessing certain conceptual and terminological links with the inhabitants of Qumran.[100] It seems very likely that the Similitudes were produced by either the survivors or heirs of the Qumranic *yaḥad*, perhaps in a Transjordanian or East Syrian environment, from where it (along with other works possessing Qumran affinities like the Book of Giants) migrated eastward to Mesopotamian religious communities of various intellectual persuasions,[101] eventually reaching Mani.

NOTES

[1]*CMC* 58.6-60.12. Text cited from L. Koenen and C. Römer, *Der Kölner Mani-Kodex ... Kritische Edition* (Opladen: Westdeutscher Verlag, 1988) 38-40.

[2]ܗ ܫܢܐ ܕܚܢܘܟ ܗܘ ܐܬܝ ... See *Chronique de Michel le Syrien, patriarche jacobite d'Antioche, 1166-1199* (4 vols.; ed. J.-B. Chabot; reprinted, Brussels: Culture et civilisation, 1963) 4.465 (text).

[3]S. Hopkins, *A Miscellany of Literary Pieces from the Cambridge Genizah Collections* (Cambridge University Library Genizah Series 3; Cambridge: Cambridge University Library, 1978) 1.

[4]By contrast, rabbinic tradition applies this epithet most frequently to the patriarch Joseph. See the remarks of L. Ginzberg, *The Legends of the Jews* (7 vols.; Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society, 1909-38) 5.324-25 n.3.

[5]Unless otherwise stated, all citations of the Greek versions of *1 Enoch* are taken from *Apocalypsis Henochi Graece* (PVTG 3; ed. M. Black; Leiden: Brill, 1970).

[6]Translation is that of F.I. Andersen, *OTP* 1.103; see also p. 102 nn. a and c.

[7]Unless otherwise stated, all citations from the Greek text of *T. 12 Patr.* rely upon M. de Jonge, *The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs: A Critical Edition of the Greek Text* (PVTG 1.2; Leiden: Brill, 1978). In addition to the specific texts cited above, note also de Jonge's index *s.v.* Ἐνώχ and the manuscript evidence cited at those locations.

[8]Ενωχ εὐηρέστησεν κυρίῳ καὶ μετετέθη (reflecting so far LXX Gen 5:24) *ὑπόδειγμα μετανοίας ταῖς γενεαῖς*. The Hebrew text for the relevant words reads אות דעת לדור ודור "a sign of knowledge for later generations." The Greek rendering would seem to display a polemical edge. So too Box and Oesterley, *APOT* 1.482.

[9]*Abr.* 17-18 interprets Enoch as a type for "repentance."

[10]δίκαιος δὲ ἐὰν φθάσῃ τελευτῆσαι ἐν ἀναπαύσει ἔσται ... εὐάρεστος θεῷ γενόμενος ἠγαπήθη καὶ ζῶν μεταξὺ ἁμαρτωλῶν μετετέθη· ἥρπάγη μὴ κακία ἀλλάξῃ σύνεσιν αὐτοῦ ἢ δόλος ἀπατήσῃ ψυχὴν αὐτοῦ. Translation is that of S. Holmes, *APOT* 1.540-41.

[11]ויתהלך חנוך את האלהים וגו׳ אמר ר׳ חמא בר׳ הושעיא אימו נכתב בתוך טומוסן שלצדיקים אלא בטומוסן שלרשעים ר׳ אייבו אמר חנוך חנף היה פעמים צדיק פעמים רשע אמר הקב״ה עד שהוא צדיק אסלקנו (Theodor-Albeck 1.238).

[12]See Theodor's notes *ad loc.*; also S.D. Fraade, *Enosh and His Generation: Pre-Israelite Hero and History in Postbiblical Interpretation* (Chico, CA: Scholars Press, 1984) 212 n.104. Neither Theodor nor Fraade however call attention to the emphasis laid upon the epithet "righteous" in this passage.

[13]Rom 9:2 begins almost identically: ὅτι λύπη μοί ἐστιν μεγάλη, rendered by the Peshitta as ܕܟܝ ܠܝ ܡ ܕܗܘܝ ܟܝ.

[14]Some of the Aramaic version survives, allowing us to recover the original form of this expression. Greek σκληρῶν ὧν ἐλάλησαν λόγων apparently renders רברבן [מלין] וקשין, "haughty and hard words." Compare M. Sokoloff, "Notes on the Aramaic Fragments of Enoch from Qumran Cave 4," *MAARAV* 1/2 (1978-79) 205. *1 Enoch* 5:4

you altered your behavior ... and spoke haughty and hard things with your unclean mouths," reading בפם in accord with the Greek translation (ἐν στόματι ἀκαθαρσίας ὑμῶν) in place of the difficult ביום. Note also Dan 7:8 on the "little horn" (= Antiochus IV): ופם ממלל רברבן "and a mouth speaking boastfully"; 7:25: ומלין לצד עליא ימלל ולקדישי עליונין יבלא "he will speak words against the Most High, and will harass the holy ones of the Most High." A thematic connection between *1 Enoch* 1:9; 5:4ff. and Dan 7 has been plausibly argued by L. Hartman, *Asking For A Meaning: A Study of 1 Enoch* 1-5 (Lund: CWK Gleerup, 1979) 26, 30-31.

[15]Aramaic: ר]ן דרה להן לד[ר ר]חיק אנה ממ[לל.

[16]... κατακλυσμὸν κόσμῳ ἀσεβῶν ἐπάξας. Cf. also Jude 14-15: προεφήτευσεν δὲ καὶ τούτοις ἕβδομος ἀπὸ Ἀδὰμ Ἐνὼχ λέγων, Ἰδοὺ ἦλθεν κύριος ἐν ἁγίαις μυριάσιν αὐτοῦ, ποιῆσαι κρίσιν κατὰ πάντων καὶ ἐλέγξαι πᾶσαν ψυχὴν περὶ πάντων τῶν ἔργων ἀσεβείας αὐτῶν ὧν ἠσέβησαν καὶ περὶ πάντων τῶν σκληρῶν ὧν ἐλάλησαν κατ' αὐτοῦ ἁμαρτωλοὶ ἀσεβεῖς. Much of this of course is a quotation of *1 Enoch* 1:9 which is applied by "Jude" to his own social situation. Note also *m. Sanh.* 10:3: דור המבול אין להם חלק לעולם הבא ואין עומדין בדין ... רבי נחמיה אומר אלו ואלו (דור המבול ואנשי סדום) אינן עומדין בדין שנאמר על כן לא יקמו רשעים במשפט וחטאים בעדת צדיקים (תהלים א ה). על כן לא יקמו רשעים במשפט זה דור המבול וחטאים בעדת צדיקים אלו אנשי סדום.

[17]See *t. Soṭ.* 3.6-7; *Mek., Beshallaḥ* 2 (Horovitz-Rabin 121-22); *Sifre Deut* §43 (Finkelstein 92-93); *b. Sanh.* 108a; *Pirqe R. El.* 22 (Luria 50b); Rashi *ad* Job 21:6.

[18]Translation taken from NJPS edition.

[19]See Rashi to Job 21:6: ונבהלתי: שאני רואה רשעי דור המבול עתקו גם גברו חיל.

[20]*Pirqe R. El.* 22. Text cited and translated from the edition of M. Higger, *Horeb* 9 (1946) 147. For further discussion of this particular passage, see J.C. Reeves, "Utnapishtim in the Book of Giants?" *JBL* 112 (1993) 111-12 n.5.

[21]*3 Enoch* 4:1-3 (= Schäfer §5, from Ms. Vat. 228). Citations of (and from) *3 Enoch* are taken from *Synopse zur Hekhalot-Literatur* (ed. P. Schäfer; Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr, 1981) §§1-80.

[22]*2 Enoch* 1:2-4, 8 (short version), as translated by F.I. Andersen, *OTP* 1.105-109.

[23]See M. Philonenko, "Une citation manichéenne du livre d'Hénoch," *RHPR* 52 (1972) 337-40.

[24]See 4 Ezra 5:13, 20; 6:35; *2 Apoc. Bar.* 6:2-8:3; 9:2-10:1; *3 Apoc. Bar.* 1:1-3. Compare Dan 10:2-5: בימים ההם אני דניאל הייתי מתאבל שלשה שבעים ימים ... וארא והנה איש אחד לבוש בדים "At that time I, Daniel, *was engaged in mourning* for three full weeks ... and I looked, and behold, a man clothed in white linen ...." While "weeping" is not literally mentioned here, it is certainly presupposed as a standard component of ritual mourning: cf. Deut 21:13 and the commentary of Ibn Ezra *ad loc.*

[25]M. Idel, *Kabbalah: New Perspectives* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1988) 75-88. M. Himmelfarb has criticized Idel's assertion, especially as it pertains to the older apocalyptic traditions. See her *Ascent to Heaven in Jewish and Christian Apocalypses* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1993) 106-107.

[26]1QM 9:15 (Michael, Gabriel, Raphael, Sariel); *1 Enoch* 9:1 (Greek: Michael, Gabriel, Raphael, Uriel; Ethiopic: Michael, Gabriel, Uriel, Suriel, with some manuscript variants); 40:2-10; 71:9 (Michael, Gabriel, Raphael, Phanuel). See also *Pirqe R. El.* 4 (Luria 9b): ד״ כתוח של מלאכי השרת מקלסין לפני הקב״ה מחנה ראשונה מיכאל מימינו מחנה שניה של גבריאל על שמאלו מחנה שלישית של אוריאל מלפניו מחנה רביעית של רפאל מלאחריו, while in the same *pereq* (10a) we also have ושבעה מלאכים שנבראו מתחלה משרתים לפמיו. There seems to be an attempt here to accomodate competing conceptions of "four" and "seven" archangelic

entities. The four "illuminators" (φωστῆρες), identified in Sethian gnostic works as (H)armozel, Oriel, Daveithai, and Eleleth, are probably reflexes of the Enochic quartet of archangels: note especially the survival of Uriel in the latter list in unaltered form, as well as the name "Gabriel" among those of their "ministers." See *Ap. John* 7.30-8.25; *Gos. Eg.* 51:15-22; 52.10-16; 64.26; *Hyp. Arch.* 93.9ff.; *Zost.* 29.2-20; 127.18-128.7; *Melch.* 6.4-5; *Trim. Prot.* 38.31-39.13, as well as G.G. Stroumsa, *Another Seed: Studies in Gnostic Mythology* (NHS 24; Leiden: Brill, 1984) 55 n.77. Their names are visible, although in somewhat corrupt form, in Irenaeus, *Adv. haer.* 1.29.2.

[27]H. Gunkel, "Der Schreiberengel Nabû im A.T. und im Judentum," *ARW* 1 (1898) 294-300; H. Bietenhard, *Die himmlische Welt im Urchristentum und Spätjudentum* (Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr, 1951) 106. Note A. Hultgård, "Das Judentum in der hellenistisch-römischen Zeit und die iranische Religion: ein religionsgeschichtliches Problem," *ANRW* II.19.1 (Berlin: W. de Gruyter, 1979) 546: "Was die Siebenzahl anbelangt, müssen wir in erster Linie mit babylonischen Einflüssen rechnen."

[28]Some scholars suggest that Iranian influence is the determinative factor in the development of a seven-archangel scheme in Second Temple Judaism. For a summary of this argument, along with references to the secondary literature, see M. Boyce and F. Grenet, *A History of Zoroastrianism, Volume Three: Zoroastrianism under Macedonian and Roman Rule* (Leiden: Brill, 1991) 404-405.

[29]NJPS translation.

[30]See *b. Šabb.* 55a: א״ל הקב״ה לגבריאל לך ורשום על מצחן של צדיקים חיו של דיו שלא ישלטו בהם מלאכי חבלה ועל מצחם של רשעים תיו של דם כדי שישלטו בהם מלאכי חבלה.

[31]P. de Lagarde, *Prophetae Chaldaice: Paulus de Lagarde e fide codicis reuchliniani edidit* (Leipzig: B.G. Teubner, 1872).

[32]An early example is Tob 12:15: ἐγώ εἰμι Ραφαηλ, *εἷς ἐκ τῶν ἑπτὰ ἁγίων ἀγγέλων*, οἳ προσαναφέρουσιν τὰς προσευχὰς τῶν ἁγίων καὶ εἰσπορεύονται ἐνώπιον τῆς δόξης τοῦ ἁγίου (Version BA).

[33]Translation is that of M.A. Knibb, *The Ethiopic Book of Enoch* (2 vols.; Oxford: Clarendon, 1978) 2.214.

[34]M. Himmelfarb has recently articulated a compelling explanation for the distinctive white clothing worn by certain angels. According to her, their dress reflects their priestly status as ministers in the heavenly Temple. See her *Ascent to Heaven* 18-20.

[35]Translation is that of M. de Jonge, "The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs," *AOT* (Sparks) 530.

[36]Only six names survive here in Ethiopic manuscripts, doubtlessly due to faulty transmission.

[37]The duplicate versions are largely identical, save that Remiel takes the place of Gabriel in one manuscript.

[38]Cf. C. Newsom, *Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice: A Critical Edition* (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1985) 31-34.

[39]*3 Enoch* 17 (= Schäfer §21, from Ms. Vat. 228). For the renderings of the seven angelic names, I have used P. Alexander, *OTP* 1.269.

[40]NJPS translation.

[41]G. Vermes, *The Dead Sea Scrolls in English* (3d ed.; London: Penguin, 1987) 122.

[42]Perhaps the closest we come to this motif is *1 Enoch* 68:4-5, where Michael refuses to serve as an advocate for the fallen Watchers. Might this explain why their hopes are pinned upon Enoch (*1 Enoch* 13:4)?

[43]The image of Michael in later literature develops along at least three distinct yet concurrent tangents: (1) Michael as military commander and leader of the heavenly army, as in Rev 12:7 and *PGM* XIII.928; (2) Michael as heavenly high priest, as in *b. Menaḥ.* 110a; *b. Zebaḥ.* 62a; *b. Ḥag.* 12b; *3 Apoc. Bar.* 11-17; and (3) Michael as personal communicant of divine mysteries, attested especially in *1 Enoch*, *Adam and Eve*, and *Testament of Abraham*.

[44]M 4b: *rwp'yl myx'yl gbr'yl sr'yl*; M 20: *rwp'yl gbr'yl myx'yl sr'yl*; M 1202: *myh'yl sr'yl rwf'yl 'wd gbr'yl*; and M 781 + M 1314 + M 1315: *myx'yl 'wd rwf'yl 'wd gbr'yl*. Texts cited from the edition of M. Boyce, *A Reader in Manichaean Middle Persian and Parthian* (Leiden: Brill, 1975) 187-92; see H.-J. Klimkeit, *Hymnen und Gebete der Religion des Lichts: Iranische und türkische liturgische Texte der Manichäer Zentralasiens* (Opladen: Westdeutscher Verlag, 1989) 198-201; 206-210.

[45]There is a vast literature on this subject which I have no intention of reproducing here. For an authoritative treatment along with copious bibliography, see J. Naveh and S. Shaked, *Amulets and Magic Bowls: Aramaic Incantations of Late Antiquity* (Jerusalem: Magnes Press, 1985); idem, *Magic Spells and Formulae: Aramaic Incantations of Late Antiquity* (Jerusalem: Magnes Press, 1993). See also J.D. BeDuhn, "Magic Bowls and Manichaeans," *Ancient Magic and Ritual Power* (ed. M. Meyer and P. Mirecki; Leiden: Brill, 1995) 419-34, a pre-publication copy of which Dr. BeDuhn has kindly shared with me.

[46]Of course the employment of "Manichaean script" on some of the bowls cannot be used as an argument for their "Manichaean" provenance; see J.A. Montgomery, "A Magical Bowl-Text and the Original Script of the Manichaeans," *JAOS* 32 (1912) 433-38; J.N. Epstein, "Gloses babylo-araméennes," *REJ* 74 (1922) 41. Instead, as Epstein rightly remarks, "ici c'est le *contenu* qui doit décider." Montgomery states: " ... the bowls [i.e., from Nippur] themselves contain no traces of Manichaeism" (*JAOS* 32 [1912] 438). While such a pronouncement might have seemed incontestable at the beginning of the present century, the subsequent Turfan, Medinat Madi, and Qumran manuscript discoveries (to mention only three of the most significant) have revolutionized our understanding of the relationship of Manichaeism to the "ancestral religions," and particularly to currents within Judaism. For example, one line of the text published by Montgomery in his 1912 *JAOS* article refers to שמחיוא מריא בגדאנא "Shemhazai, lord of the *bagdanas*," a clear allusion to the infamous ringleader of the fallen Watchers who plays such a prominent role in *1 Enoch* 6-16 and the Qumran Book of Giants. While Epstein argues for the Jewish provenance of this bowl on the basis of its angelological background (*REJ* 74 [1922] 45; cf. also idem, "Zum magischen Texte (Journal of the American Oriental Society 1912, p. 434 seq.)," *JAOS* 33 [1913] 279-80), one could also contend, given the demonstrable popularity of Enochic literature in Manichaean communities, that a Manichaean background is equally possible. As for the *bagdanas*, see the important discussion of J.C. Greenfield, "Some Notes on Some Aramaic and Mandaic Magic Bowls," *JANESCU* 5 (1973) 153-54. Compare also S. Shaked, "Bagdāna, King of the Demons, and Other Iranian Terms in Babylonian Magic," *Papers in Honour of Mary Boyce* (Acta Iranica 24-25; 2 vols.; Leiden: Brill, 1985) 1.511-25; idem, *Dualism in Transformation: Varieties of Religion in Sasanian Iran* (London: School of Oriental and African Studies, 1994) 90.

[47]4QEn^{b} 1 iii 7 (= *1 Enoch* 9:1). See J.T. Milik, *The Books of Enoch: Aramaic Fragments of Qumrân Cave 4* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1976) 170.

[48]Spelled here שריאל as in the Aramaic fragments of *1 Enoch*.

[49]See J.C. Reeves, *Jewish Lore in Manichaean Cosmogony: Studies in the Book of Giants Traditions* (Cincinnati: Hebrew Union College Press, 1992) 142 n.156.

[50]Textually this clause is supported only by the Ethiopic evidence and Charles's Latin ms L^{1}; see R.H. Charles, *The Ascension of Isaiah* (London: Adam and Charles Black, 1900) 104. Compare the Greek "prophetic legend" (*apud* ibid. 143): εἰς τοῦτο γὰρ ἀπεστάλην τοῦ ἀνενέγκαι σε ἕως ἑβδόμου οὐρανοῦ ....

[51]Translation is that of R.H. Charles and J.M.T. Barton, "The Ascension of Isaiah," *AOT* (Sparks) 797.

[52]Reading singular *saragalā* with Flemming's critical apparatus, as opposed to plural *saragalāt* in his main text. See the following note.

[53]Ethiopic text cited from the edition of J. Flemming, *Das Buch Henoch: Äthiopischer Text* (Leipzig: J.C. Hinrichs, 1902) 86-87; see also I. Gruenwald, *Apocalyptic and Merkavah Mysticism* (Leiden: Brill, 1980) 119; E. Isaac, *OTP* 1.11, 37, 49. Compare the translation of A. Caquot: "Il fut élevé sur le char du vent, et son nom fut retiré d'entre eux," quoted from idem, "I Hénoch," *La Bible: écrits intertestamentaires* (ed. A. Dupont-Sommer and M. Philonenko; Paris: Gallimard, 1987) 549; compare Caquot, "Remarques sur les chapitres 70 et 71 du livre éthiopien d'Hénoch," *Apocalypses et théologie de l'espérance: Congrès de Toulouse (1975)* (LD 95; Paris: Les Éditions du Cerf, 1977) 113-14. See also J.C. Reeves, "Jewish Pseudepigrapha in Manichaean Literature: The Role of the Enochic Library," *Tracing the Threads: Studies in the Vitality of Jewish Pseudepigrapha* (SBLEJL 6; ed. J.C. Reeves; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1994) 199 n.53. A very similar motif appears in the *Apocryphon of James* (NHC I.2), where Jesus ascends to the Father via the agency of a "spiritual chariot" (14.34). See H.-C. Puech and G. Quispel, "Les écrits gnostiques du Codex Jung," *VC* 8 (1954) 15-18.

[54]Ethiopic *nafāsāt*; Greek ἄνεμοι.

[55]*'awlo nafāsāt* "whirlwinds" (*1 Enoch* 39:3); *nak^{w}ark^{w}āra nafās* "whirlwind" (*1 Enoch* 52:1). With regard to Ethiopic *'awlo*, compare Aramaic עלעולא "whirlwind," the Targumic rendering of Hebrew סערה in 2 Kgs 2:11.

[56]Translation cited from that of R.H. Charles and M. Whittaker, "The Life of Adam and Eve," *AOT* (Sparks) 153. "Paradise of righteousness" (פרדס קשטא , τὸν παράδεισον τῆς δικαιοσύνης) is a term found almost exclusively in Enochic literature. See *1 Enoch* 32:3; 60:23; 77:3; *2 Enoch* 13:27 (short version). Its occurrence here is highly suggestive regarding the provenance of this particular angelophany.

[57]For the expression בכנפי רוח used in the context of heavenly transport, see 2 Sam 22:11; Ps 104:3.

[58]Text cited from Ms. Vat. 228 (Schäfer §10).

[59]See *1 Enoch* 36:2; 39:3; 60:11; 71:4. Compare Deut 30:4: בקצה השמים , rendered by *Targum Onqelos* as בסיפי שמיא ; 4Q*266* line 4: קצי [ה]שמים , cited from J.M. Baumgarten, "A 'Scriptural' Citation in 4Q Fragments of the Damascus Document," *JJS* 43 (1992) 95.

[60]Translation of the Ethiopic text supplied by Flemming 87.

[61]In the *CMC* fragment the phrase functions locatively—Enoch travels *as far as* the very "ends of the heavens." In *1 Enoch* 71:4, Enoch is shown "all the secrets of the ends of heaven," a locution whose significance is more ambiguous. The latter instance *may* be interpreted to refer to the extent of Enoch's travels, as in the *CMC* passage, but it may also (or may instead) simply indicate that Enoch was given access to certain mysterious objects or phenomena housed at the horizons of the physical universe.

[62]The language is reminiscent of the rabbinic concept of the divine מדות—the מדת הרחמים and the מדת הדין .

[63]Translation from M.A. Knibb, "1 Enoch," *AOT* (Sparks) 222.

[64]Or alternatively, that 71:3 consciously summarizes the earlier traditions in 39:4-5 and the succeeding verses. *1 Enoch* 70-71 are formally distinct from the three "parables" of *1 Enoch* 37-69, and may very well have been appended to those chapters by a later editor; see the remarks of G.W.E. Nickelsburg, *Jewish Literature between the Bible and the Mishnah: A Historical and Literary Introduction* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1981) 221. A relationship between chapters 39 and 71 has been noticed by Caquot, "Remarques" 111.

[65]Knibb, *AOT* (Sparks) 224.

[66]Michael is explicitly identified as the revelatory angel in both *1 Enoch* 71:3 and the *CMC* fragment, whereas the accompanying angel of *1 Enoch* 39-40 remains anonymous (cf. 40:2). Whatever his identity, he cannot be Michael: see 41:8-9.

[67]See Reeves, "Jewish Pseudepigrapha" 182-83; 199 n.54.

[68]C. Brockelmann, *Lexicon Syriacum* (2d ed.; reprinted, Hildesheim: Georg Olms, 1982) 72.

[69]See M. Lidzbarski, *Ginzā: Der Schatz oder das grosse Buch der Mandäer* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1925) 615 *s.v.* Welt der Finsternis.

[70]Ibid. 611-12 *s.v.* Ort der Finsternis.

[71]See for example *S. Ephraemi Syri ... Opera Selecta* (ed. J.J. Overbeck; Oxford: Clarendon, 1865) 60 line 8. Many more instances of such phraseology can be culled from J.C. Reeves, "Manichaean Citations from the Prose Refutations of Ephrem," *Emerging from the Darkness* (ed. J. BeDuhn, forthcoming).

[72]Theodore bar Konai, *Liber Scholiorum* (CSCO scrip. syri, ser. II, t. 66; ed. A. Scher; Paris: Carolus Poussielgue, 1912) 313.18-21: ܗܘ ܕܚܫܘܟܐ ܡܠܟܐ ܕܚܫܘܟܐ ܘܐܡܪ ܕܒܬܠܬܗ ܫܪܐ ܥܡ ܚܡܫ ܐܝܢܘܗܝ ܕܢܘܪܐ ܘܕܢܘܪܐ ܘܕܪܘܚܐ ܘܕܡܝܐ ܘܕܚܫܘܟܐ. "The Evil Essence he (Mani) terms the King of Darkness, and he says that he dwelt in the land of Darkness with his five Aeons: the Aeon of smoke, the Aeon of fire, the Aeon of wind, the Aeon of water, and the Aeon of darkness." Translation reproduced from Reeves, *Jewish Lore* 190.

[73]Darkness is of course an attribute of the older biblical concept of Sheol. See Job 10:21-22; Ps 88:11-13.

[74]I have chosen to render the Greek version of these verses, since the Ethiopic appears to have suffered some corruption and expansion: αὐτοὶ ὑμεῖς γινώσκετε ὅτι εἰς ᾅδου κατάξουσιν τὰς ψυχὰς ὑμῶν, καὶ ἐκεῖ ἔσονται ἐν ἀνάγκῃ μεγάλῃ καὶ ἐν σκότει καὶ ἐν παγίδι καὶ ἐν φλογὶ καιομένῃ, καὶ εἰς κρίσιν μεγάλην εἰσελεύσονται αἱ ψυχαὶ ὑμῶν ἐν πάσαις ταῖς γενεαῖς τοῦ αἰῶνος. οὐαὶ ὑμῖν, οὐκ ἔστιν ὑμῖν χαίρειν.

[75]See 1QS 2:8: לזעות אחה לאין רחמים כחושך מעשיכה וזעום אחה באפלת אש עולמים ; 4:12-13: ארור אחה לאין רחמים נצח וחרפת עד עם כלמת כלה באש מחשכים .

[76]Translation from A. Pennington, "2 Enoch," *AOT* (Sparks) 331-32.

[77]See Reeves, "Jewish Pseudepigrapha" 189; 203 n.98.

[78]Greek: οὗ ἡ πηγὴ τοῦ ὕδατος ἐν αὐτῷ φωτινή.

[79]Compare the eventual destiny of the righteous according to 1QS 4:7-8: ושמחת עולמים בחיי נצח וכליל כבוד עם מדת הדר באור עולמים "and ceaseless rejoicing during eternal life, and a crown of glory trimmed with splendor amidst eternal light." See also *2 Enoch* 13:27 below.

[80]Translation from Knibb, *AOT* (Sparks) 236-37.

[81]Ibid. 319.

[82]Translation from Pennington, *AOT* (Sparks) 345.

[83]Text and translation cited from the edition of J.H. Charlesworth, *The Odes of Solomon: The Syriac Texts* (reprinted, Chico, CA: Scholars Press, 1977) 50-52.

[84]The present author is currently engaged in the task of collecting and analyzing these textual traditions which are found in later Jewish, Christian, pagan, gnostic, and Muslim sources.

[85]R.H. Charles, *The Book of Enoch or 1 Enoch* (2d ed.; Oxford: Clarendon, 1912) xii. Charles collects a representative sampling of later citations of or allusions to works allegedly authored by Enoch (pp. xii-xiv). These can now be expanded given the archaeological and textual discoveries since Charles's day.

[86]4QEn^{c} 5 ii 26: ...] קדישין אחויוני ואחויוני [.....] ידע אנה ברזי . Text cited from Milik, *Books of Enoch* 209. The Greek version is defective here, and the Ethiopic version understands God as the sole revealer of knowledge to Enoch.

[87]Translation from Knibb, *AOT* (Sparks) 184. The surviving Aramaic fragment preserves only ומן מלי [עירין] וקדישין כלה "the whole of it from the words of [the Watchers] and Holy Ones [I transcribed? I learned?]," a phrase that despite its brevity indicates some significant divergence from the Greek and Ethiopic versions. Aramaic text cited from Milik, *Books of Enoch* 142.

[88]Translation is that of R.H. Charles and C. Rabin, "Jubilees," *AOT* (Sparks) 23.

[89]We may safely ignore so-called *3 Enoch*, as it is a modern misnomer. Our primary concern is with those works that claim Enochic authorship.

[90]The so-called "Astronomical Chapters" (*1 Enoch* 72-82) do not appear to be utilized in the *CMC* fragment. Manichaeism however was thoroughly familiar with this material as well; see F.C. Andreas and W.B. Henning, "Mitteliranische Manichaica aus Chinesisch-Turkestan I," *SPAW* (1932) 187-91; W.B. Henning, "Ein manichäisches Henochbuch," *SPAW* (1934) 32-35; J. Tubach, "Spuren des astronomischen Henochbuches bei den Manichäern Mittelasiens," *Nubia et Oriens Christianus: Festschrift für C. Detlef G. Müller zum 60. Geburtstag* (ed. P.O. Scholz and R. Stempel; Köln: J. Dinter, 1988) 73-95.

[91]See especially H.J. Lawlor, "Early Citations from the Book of Enoch," *Journal of Philology* 25 (1897) 164-225; A.-M. Denis, *Introduction aux pseudépigraphes grecs d'Ancien Testament* (SVTP 1; Leiden: Brill, 1970) 15-30; Milik, *Books of Enoch* 70-135; J.C. VanderKam, "1 Enoch in Early Christian Literature," *The Jewish Apocalyptic Heritage in Early Christianity* (CRINT III.4; ed. J.C. VanderKam and W. Adler; Minneapolis & Assen: Fortress & Van Gorcum, forthcoming). I am grateful to Professor VanderKam for kindly sharing a copy of his essay prior to its publication.

[92]Ethiopic *'egzi'a manāfest*. Compare Num 16:22 (אל אלהי הרוחות) ; 27:16 (י אלהי הרוחות) ; 2 Macc 3:24 (ὁ τῶν πνευμάτων ... δυνάστης); 1QH 10:8 (אדון לכול רוח) . The expression "Lord of Spirits" renders the familiar Hebrew designation י צבאות . This explanation is based upon *1 Enoch* 39:12, which explicitly paraphrases Isa 6:3. See N. Schmidt, "The Original Language of the Parables of Enoch," *Old Testament and Semitic Studies in Memory of William Rainey Harper* (2 vols.; ed. R.F. Harper, F. Brown, and G.F. Moore; Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1908) 2.343; J.A. Goldstein, *II Maccabees: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary* (AB 41A; Garden City: Doubleday, 1983) 212; M. Black, *The Book of Enoch or I Enoch* (SVTP 7; Leiden: Brill, 1985) 189-92. Note also the distinctively Isaianic expression האדון י צבאות (Isa 1:24; 3:1; 10:16, 33; 19:4). By discretely avoiding the writing of the Tetragrammaton (*à*

la Qumran) and simultaneously interpreting צבאות as הרוחות, the epithet "Lord of Spirits" (אדון הרוחות) emerges.

[93]See Schmidt, "Original Language" 329-49; E. Ullendorff, "An Aramaic 'Vorlage' of the Ethiopic Text of Enoch?" *Atti del convegno internazionale di studi etiopici* (Rome: Accademia nazionale dei Lincei, 1960) 259-67, reprinted in Ullendorff, *Is Biblical Hebrew a Language?* (Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz, 1977) 172-81; J.C. Greenfield and M.E. Stone, "The Enochic Pentateuch and the Date of the Similitudes," *HTR* 70 (1977) 61; Nickelsburg, *Jewish Literature* 223; Knibb, *Ethiopic Book* 2.37-46, esp. pp. 41-42.

[94]E. Sjöberg, *Der Menschensohn im äthiopischen Henochbuch* (Lund: Gleerup, 1946) 37-39; J.C. Greenfield, "Prolegomenon," *apud* H. Odeberg, *3 Enoch* (reprinted, New York: Ktav, 1973) xvii; Greenfield-Stone, *HTR* 70 (1977) 58-60; Nickelsburg, *Jewish Literature* 219, but less confidently on pp. 221-22; M.E. Stone, "Apocalyptic Literature," *Jewish Writings of the Second Temple Period* (CRINT II.2; Philadelphia & Assen: Fortress & Van Gorcum, 1984) 398-99.

[95]J.C. Hindley, "Towards a Date for the Similitudes of Enoch: An Historical Approach," *NTS* 14 (1967-68) 551-65.

[96]Milik, *Books of Enoch* 89-98.

[97]See the remarks of M.A. Knibb, "The Date of the Parables of Enoch: A Critical Review," *NTS* 25 (1979) 355. Note too the similarity between *1 Enoch* 56:5 and a prophetic logion (late 1st century CE?) found in the Book of Elchasai *apud* Hippolytus, *Refutatio* 9.16.4.

[98]Note E. Schürer, *The History of the Jewish People in the Age of Jesus Christ* (4 vols. in 3; ed. G. Vermes, F. Millar, and M. Goodman; Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1973-87) 3/1.258-59 n.21, particularly the citations from *b. Sanh.* 98a-b.

[99]See also J.C. Reeves, "An Enochic Motif in Manichaean Tradition," *Manichaica Selecta: Studies Presented to Professor Julien Ries on the Occasion of his Seventieth Birthday* (ed. A. van Tongerloo and S. Giversen; Louvain: International Association of Manichaean Studies, 1991) 295-98. I argued there that *1 Enoch* 60:7-10 serves as the textual source for a Manichaean cosmogonic mytheme.

[100]Greenfield, "Prolegomenon" xvii-xviii; Greenfield-Stone, *HTR* 70 (1977) 56-57.

[101]I am thinking particularly here of the important role Enoch comes to play in late antique and medieval Ḥarranian paganism (so-called Sabianism). See Chapter Five, nn.50-56 above.

CONCLUSION

CHAPTER EIGHT

REASSESSING SYRO-MESOPOTAMIAN GNOSIS AND JEWISH TRADITIONS: SOME CONCLUDING REMARKS

Although Manichaeism and Mandaeism are convenient taxonomic rubrics for at least two distinct systems of biblically affiliated religiosity, the evidence indicates that both of these gnostic groups (among others) espouse a particular type of speculative thought that can be termed "Syro-Mesopotamian gnosis," a form of mythological expression and exposition which is in turn ultimately rooted in Jewish biblical exegesis. The phrase "Syro-Mesopotamian gnosis" labels a regional trajectory that expresses itself in a series of discrete ideological formulations within the religious discourse of confessionally disparate communities in Syria (including Palestine), Mesopotamia, and Iran during late antiquity and even into the medieval era. Demonstration of the appeal of gnostic streams of religiosity among certain circles within these communities is relatively straightforward and uncontested. For example, the earliest attested figures espousing a "gnostic" perspective (at least as defined by Justin and Irenaeus) hail from Palestine and Syria. Many of the so-called "classical" gnostic texts (e.g., some of the Nag Hammadi corpus) retain features which suggest an original Syro-Mesopotamian provenance. One must also take into account the proto-gnostic proclivities of Syro-Mesopotamian productions like the *Odes of Solomon*, the *Ascension of Isaiah*, the *Hymn of the Pearl*, certain apocryphal *Adamschriften*, and the Pseudo-Clementine corpus. Finally, the persistent and recurrent flowering during the course of the first post-Christian millennium of a bewildering diversity of seemingly "native" forms of gnosticism—e.g., Manichaeism, Mazdakism, Mandaeism, the Islamic extremist *ġhulat* sects, the Jewish groups associated with the production of the *Ma'aseh Bereshit* literature (e.g., *Sefer Yeṣirah*; the sources behind *Sefer ha-Bahir*)—indicates the vibrant vitality of gnostic ideologies throughout this region during this period. While the careful scholarly study of possible interrelationships among this host of seemingly disparate religious formulations remains in its infancy, preliminary soundings have uncovered evidence of a sustained intellectual conversation among many of these groups throughout the first millennium of the Common Era. The precise cultural and social dynamics that undergird their cross-fertilization remain somewhat obscure, but some foundational elements in this syncretic thought-world are now beginning to be exposed.

Of signal importance are the teachings associated with the primal biblical forefathers, the "heralds of that Good Realm."

Sustained analysis of the five allegedly Jewish pseudepigraphic texts cited in the *Cologne Mani Codex* reveals that they possess a pronounced gnostic flavor and texture. They are almost certainly not authentic products of those Jewish scribal circles responsible for the manufacture and distribution of biblically inspired pseudepigraphic literature in the eastern Mediterranean world during the Persian, Hellenistic, or Roman eras of Jewish history. Yet the types of traditions transmitted under the aegis of each forefather exhibit in most cases remarkable affinities with the extant corpora of exegetical and legendary materials surrounding these figures in Jewish, Christian, and Muslim literature. The *Codex* "apocalypses" are hence not simply imaginative literature; rather, they are creative adaptations of the traditional lore which had gathered about these primeval ancestors since the dawn of a scribal interest in their proleptic and homiletic value.

The motivation behind this manipulative aggrandizement of aggadic themes is not difficult to isolate. Mani repeatedly stressed the antiquity, the veracity, and the univocality of his religious message: his was not a "new" teaching or doctrinal formulation, nor an artificial, consciously crafted one, but one that was grounded in revelatory events experienced by various trustworthy adepts whose careers effectively linked the whole of human history. The religion which he proclaimed during the third century of the Common Era was supposedly identical with the uncorrupted form of the religion preached by those ancient "heralds of that Good Realm"; that is, what detritus can be recovered of it from the textually authenticated testimonia of Adam, Seth, Enosh, Shem, and Enoch. Of these five figures, the legendary material associated with Enoch, Adam, and Seth seems to have required only minimal adjustment to Manichaean norms: a wealth of traditions, such as are visible in the Enochic library and Christian *Adamschriften*, was available for polemical exploitation and development; and, as we have seen in our examinations of the relevant *Codex* "apocalypses," the interstices between the "orthodox" and "gnostic" readings of these biblical characters are readily apparent. The figures of Enosh and Shem proved more problematic. Although not totally devoid of postbiblical attributes and development within the classical traditions, they lacked the kinds of revelatory credentials commonly associated with their more celebrated colleagues, particularly those involving an ascent-experience and the authorship of written testimonies based upon such an event. It is then small wonder that the "apocalypses" of Enosh and Shem exhibit between them the greatest number of structural and verbal parallels to be discerned among the five pseudepigraphic citations, and that they moreover retain clear evidence of a heavy redactional hand, one which did not refrain from importing motifs and terminology that derived ultimately from sectarian doctrines. These latter two "apocalypses" should thus be viewed as parade examples of gnostic, even proto-Manichaean, fabrication, and their close relationship to the types of traditions extant in Mandaean literature should not go unremarked.

One realizes then why Baraies considered it essential to construct a catena of citations purportedly drawn from the literary testimonies of the biblical forefathers. Not only do they collectively bear witness to the apostolic credibility of Mani as a "teacher of truth," to his cultural authority, but they also firmly ensconce the Babylonian sage within the common conceptual universe of his environment. The continued currency of this ideology would receive further dramatic confirmation several centuries later, when yet another "messenger of God" would likewise proclaim the univocality of prophetic instruction with a similar vocabulary (Qur'ān 2:136).

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Abbott, N., *Studies in Arabic Literary Papyri I: Historical Texts* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1957).

Abel, A., "Les sources arabes sur le manichéisme," *Annuaire de l'institut de philologie et d'histoire orientales et slaves (Bruxelles)* 16 (1961-62) 31-73.

Abraham ibn Ezra, *Perushey ha-Torah* (3 vols.; ed. A. Weiser; Jerusalem: Mossad Harav Kook, 1977).

Adam, A., ed., *Texte zum Manichäismus* (2d ed.; Berlin: W. de Gruyter & Co., 1969).

Adam, A., and Burchard, C., *Antike Berichte über die Essener* (2d ed.; Berlin: W. de Gruyter, 1972).

Adler, W., "Jacob of Edessa and the Jewish Pseudepigrapha in Syriac Chronography," *Tracing the Threads: Studies in the Vitality of Jewish Pseudepigrapha* (SBLEJL 6; ed. J.C. Reeves; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1994) 143-71.

—, *Time Immemorial: Archaic History and its Sources in Christian Chronography from Julius Africanus to George Syncellus* (Dumbarton Oaks Studies 26; Washington, DC: Dumbarton Oaks Center for Byzantine Studies, 1989).

Aland, B., "Mani und Bardesanes—Zur Entstehung des manichäischen Systems," *Synkretismus im syrisch-persischen Kulturgebiet* (ed. A. Dietrich; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1975) 123-43.

Albeck, H., ed., *Midrash Bereshit Rabbati* (Jerusalem: Mekitze Nirdamim, 1940).

Alexander, P.S., "The Historical Setting of the Hebrew Book of Enoch," *JJS* 28 (1977) 156-80.

—, "Incantations and Books of Magic," *apud* E. Schürer, *The History of the Jewish People in the Age of Jesus Christ* (rev. ed.; 3 vols. in 4; ed. G. Vermes, F. Millar, and M. Goodman; Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1973-87) 342-79.

—, "3 (Hebrew Apocalypse of) Enoch," *OTP* 1.223-315.

Altmann, A., *Essays in Jewish Intellectual History* (Hanover, NH: University Press of New England, 1981).

—, "The Gnostic Background of the Rabbinic Adam Legends," *JQR* 35 (1944-45) 371-91.

Andersen, F.I., "2 (Slavonic Book of) Enoch," *OTP* 1.91-221.

Anderson, G.A., "The Penitence Narrative in the Life of Adam and Eve," *HUCA* 63 (1992) 1-38.

Andrae, T., *Mohammed: The Man and his Faith* (New York, 1936; reprinted, New York: Harper, 1960).

Andreas, F.C., and Henning, W.B., "Mitteliranische Manichaica aus Chinesisch-Turkestan, I," *SPAW* (1932) 175-222.

—, "Mitteliranische Manichaica aus Chinesisch-Turkestan, II," *SPAW* (1933) 294-363.

—, "Mitteliranische Manichaica aus Chinesisch-Turkestan, III," *SPAW* (1934) 848-912.

[Anonymous], "Genizah, Cairo," *EncJud* 16.1333-42.

Arnold-Döben, V., *Die Bildersprache des Manichäismus* (Köln: Brill, 1978).

Asmussen, J.P., *Manichaean Literature* (Delmar, NY: Scholars Facsimiles and Reprints, 1975).

Asmussen, J.P., and Böhlig, A., eds., *Die Gnosis III: Der Manichäismus* (Zürich and München: Artemis, 1980).

Attridge, H.W., "Greek and Latin Apocalypses," *Semeia* 14 (1979) 159-86.

Azariah di Rossi, *Me'or 'Enayim* (3 vols.; Vilna, 1866; reprinted, Jerusalem: Maqor, 1970).

Bammel, E., "Höhlenmenschen," *ZNW* 49 (1958) 77-88.

Barc, B., "Samaèl-Saklas-Yaldabaōth: recherche sur la genèse d'un mythe gnostique," *Colloque international sur les textes de Nag Hammadi (Québec, 22-25 août 1978)* (Québec: Les Presses de l'Université Laval, 1981) 123-50.

Bauer, W., *Orthodoxy and Heresy in Earliest Christianity* (ed. R.A. Kraft and G. Krodel; Philadelphia: Fortress, 1971).

Baumgarten, A.I., *The Phoenician History of Philo of Byblos* (Leiden: Brill, 1981).

Baumgarten, J.M., "A 'Scriptural' Citation in 4Q Fragments of the Damascus Document," *JJS* 43 (1992) 95-98.

Baur, F.C., *Das manichäische Religionssystem nach den Quellen neu untersucht und entwikelt* (Tübingen: C.F. Osiander, 1831).

Beausobre, I. de, *Histoire critique de Manichée et du manichéisme* (2 vols.; Amsterdam: J.F. Bernard, 1734-39).

Beck, E., ed., *Des heiligen Ephraem des Syrers Hymnen contra Haereses* (CSCO 169, scrip. syri 76; Louvain: L. Durbecq, 1957).

Beck, R., "Thus Spake Not Zarathuštra: Zoroastrian Pseudepigrapha of the Greco-Roman World," *apud* M. Boyce and F. Grenet, *A History of Zoroastrianism, Volume Three: Zoroastrianism under Macedonian and Roman Rule* (Leiden: Brill, 1991) 491-565.

BeDuhn, J.D., "Magic Bowls and Manichaeans," *Ancient Magic and Ritual Power* (ed. M. Meyer and P. Mirecki; Leiden: Brill, 1995) 419-34.

Berger, K., *Das Buch der Jubiläen* (JSHRZ II.3; Gütersloh: G. Mohn, 1981).

Bertrand, D.A., "«Paraphrase de Sem» et «Paraphrase de Seth»," *Les textes de Nag Hammadi: Colloque du Centre d'Histoire des Religions (Strasbourg, 23-25 octobre 1974)* (NHS 7; ed. J.-É. Ménard; Leiden: Brill, 1975) 146-57.

Betz, H.D., ed., *The Greek Magical Papyri in Translation* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1986).

—, "Paul in the Mani Biography (Codex Manichaicus Coloniensis)," *Codex Manichaicus Coloniensis: Atti del Simposio Internazionale (Rende-Amantea 3-7 settembre 1984)* (ed. L. Cirillo and A. Roselli; Cosenza: Marra Editore, 1986) 215-34.

Beyer, K., *Die aramäischen Texte vom Toten Meer* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1984).

Bezold, C., "Das arabische-äthiopische Testamentum Adami," *Orientalische Studien Theodor Nöldeke zum siebzigsten Geburtstag gewidmet* (2 vols.; Giessen: A. Töpelmann, 1906) 2.893-912.

—, *Die Schatzhöhle »Mĕ'ārath Gazzē«* (Leipzig, 1883-88; reprinted, Amsterdam: Philo Press, 1981).

Bidez, J., and Cumont, F., *Les mages hellénisés* (2 vols.; Paris, 1938; reprinted, New York: Arno Press, 1975).

Bietenhard, H., *Die himmlische Welt im Urchristentum und Spätjudentum* (Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr, 1951).

Bīrūnī (al-), Abu'l-Rayḥān Muḥammad ibn Aḥmad, *al-Athār al-bāqiya 'an-il-qurūn al-khāliya (Chronologie orientalischer Völker von Albêrûnî)* (ed. C.E. Sachau; reprinted, Leipzig: Otto Harrassowitz, 1923).

Black, M., ed., *Apocalypsis Henochi Graece* (PVTG 3; Leiden: Brill, 1970).

—, *The Book of Enoch or I Enoch* (SVTP 7; Leiden: Brill, 1985).

Blau, L., "Bat Ḳol," *JE* 2.588-92.

Böhlig, A., "Christliche Wurzeln im Manichäismus," *Mysterion und Wahrheit: Gesammelte Beiträge zur spätantiken Religionsgeschichte* (Leiden: Brill, 1968) 202-21.
—, "Jüdisches und Iranisches in der Adamapokalypse des Codex V von Nag Hammadi," *Mysterion und Wahrheit* 149-61.
—, "Der Synkretismus des Mani," *Synkretismus im syrisch-persischen Kulturgebiet* (ed. A. Dietrich; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1975) 144-69.
Bonwetsch, G.N., *Die Bücher der Geheimnisse Henochs: das sogenannte slavische Henochbuch* (TU 44; Leipzig: J.C. Hinrichs, 1922).
Borsch, F.H., *The Son of Man in Myth and History* (NTL; Philadelphia: Westminster, 1967).
Bousset, W., *Hauptprobleme der Gnosis* (Göttingen, 1907; reprinted, Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1973).
Bowley, J.E., "The Compositions of Abraham," *Tracing the Threads: Studies in the Vitality of Jewish Pseudepigrapha* (SBLEJL 6; ed. J.C. Reeves; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1994) 215-38.
Box, G.H., and Oesterley, W.O.E., "Sirach," *APOT* 1.268-517.
Boyce, M., *A Reader in Manichaean Middle Persian and Parthian* (Leiden: Brill, 1975).
—, "Sadwēs and Pēsūs," *BSOAS* 13 (1949-51) 908-15.
—, ed., *Textual Sources for the Study of Zoroastrianism* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1984).
—, *A Word-List of Manichaean Middle Persian and Parthian* (Leiden: Brill, 1977).
Boyce, M., and Grenet, F., *A History of Zoroastrianism, Volume Three: Zoroastrianism under Macedonian and Roman Rule* (Leiden: Brill, 1991).
Brandt, (A.J.H.) W., *Elchasai: ein Religionsstifter und sein Werk* (Leipzig: J.C. Hinrichs, 1912).
—, "Elkesaites," *ERE* 5.262-69.
—, *Die mandäische Religion* (Leipzig, 1889; reprinted, Amsterdam: Philo Press, 1973).
Braun, O., "Ein Brief des Katholikos Timotheos I über biblische Studien des 9. Jahrhunderts," *OrChr* 1 (1901) 138-52; 299-313.
Brière, M., "Les Homiliae Cathedrales de Sévère d'Antioche, traduction syriaque de Jacques d'Édesse CXX à CXXV," *PO* 29 (1960) 124-89.
Brinkmann, A., ed., *Alexander Lycopolitani: Contra Manichaei opiniones disputatio* (Leipzig: Teubner, 1895).
Brock, S.P., "A Fragment of Enoch in Syriac," *JTS* n.s. 19 (1968) 626-31.
—, "Jewish Traditions in Syriac Sources," *JJS* 30 (1979) 212-32.
—, *The Luminous Eye: The Spiritual World Vision of Saint Ephrem* (rev. ed.; Kalamazoo, MI: Cistercian Publications, 1992).
—, Review of *OTP* 1, in *JJS* 35 (1984) 200-209.
—, "Some Aspects of Greek Words in Syriac," *Synkretismus im syrisch-persischen Kulturgebiet* (ed. A. Dietrich; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1975) 80-108.
—, "Syriac Historical Writing: A Survey of the Main Sources," *Journal of the Iraqi Academy* 5 (1979-80) 1-30.
Brockelmann, C., *Lexicon Syriacum* (2d ed.; reprinted, Hildesheim: Georg Olms, 1982).
Budge, E.A.W., ed., *The Book of the Bee* (Anecdota Oxoniensia, Semitic Series 1.2; Oxford: Clarendon, 1886).
Bundy, D., "Pseudepigrapha in Syriac Literature," *Society of Biblical Literature 1991 Seminar Papers* (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1991) 745-65.
Burkitt, F.C., "Introductory Essay," *S. Ephraem's Prose Refutations of Mani, Marcion, and Bardaisan* (2 vols.; ed. C.W. Mitchell; London: Williams and Norgate, 1912-21) 2.cxi-cxliv.
Cameron, R., and Dewey, A.J., eds., *The Cologne Mani Codex (P. Colon. inv. nr. 4780): "Concerning the Origin of his Body"* (Missoula, MT: Scholars Press, 1979).

Caquot, A., "Remarques sur les chapitres 70 et 71 du livre éthiopien d'Hénoch," *Apocalypses et théologie de l'espérance: Congrès de Toulouse (1975)* (LD 95; Paris: Les Éditions du Cerf, 1977) 111-22.
—, "I Hénoch," *La Bible: écrits intertestamentaires* (ed. A. Dupont-Sommer and M. Philonenko; Paris: Gallimard, 1987) 465-625.
Cedrenus, *Compendium Historiarum* (CSHB; 2 vols.; ed. I. Bekker; Bonn: Weber, 1838).
Cerfaux, L., "Le vrai prophète des Clémentines," *RSR* 18 (1928) 143-63.
Chabot, J.-B., ed., *Chronique de Michel le Syrien, patriarche jacobite d'Antioche, 1166-1199* (4 vols.; reprinted, Bruxelles: Culture et Civilisation, 1963).
—, ed., *Incerti auctoris Chronicon Pseudo-Dionysianum vulgo dictum* (CSCO 91, 104, scrip. syri 43, 53; 2 vols.; Paris: Reipublicae, 1927).
Chadwick, H., *Priscillian of Avila: The Occult and the Charismatic in the Early Church* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1976).
Charles, R.H., *The Ascension of Isaiah* (London: Adam and Charles Black, 1900).
—, *The Book of Enoch or 1 Enoch* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1893; 2d ed., Oxford: Clarendon, 1912).
—, "Book of Enoch," *APOT* 2.163-281.
—, "The Book of Jubilees," *APOT* 2.1-82.
—, *The Ethiopic Version of the Book of Enoch* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1906).
—, *The Greek Versions of the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1908).
—, *Maṣḥafa Kufālē, or the Ethiopic Version of the Hebrew Book of Jubilees* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1895).
Charles, R.H., and Barton, J.M.T., "The Ascension of Isaiah," *AOT* (Sparks) 775-812.
Charles, R.H., and Cowley, A., "An Early Source of the Testaments of the Patriarchs," *JQR* o.s. 19 (1906-07) 566-83.
Charles, R.H., and Rabin, C., "Jubilees," *AOT* (Sparks) 1-139.
Charles, R.H., and Whittaker, M., "The Life of Adam and Eve," *AOT* (Sparks) 141-67.
Charlesworth, J.H., *The Odes of Solomon: The Syriac Texts* (reprinted, Chico, CA: Scholars Press, 1977).
—, *The Pseudepigrapha and Modern Research With a Supplement* (Chico, CA: Scholars Press, 1981).
—, "Rylands Syriac Ms. 44 and a New Addition to the Pseudepigrapha: The Treatise of Shem, Discussed and Translated," *BJRL* 60 (1977-78) 376-403.
—, "Treatise of Shem," *OTP* 1.473-80.
Christensen, A., *L'Iran sous les Sassanids* (Copenhagen: Levin & Munksgaard, 1936).
Chwolsohn, D., *Die Ssabier und der Ssabismus* (2 vols.; St. Petersburg: Kaiserlichen Akademie der Wissenschaften, 1856).
Cirillo, L., "L'apocalypse d'Elkhasai: son rôle et son importance pour l'histoire du judaisme," *Apocrypha* 1 (1990) 167-79.
Collins, J.J., "Introduction: Toward the Morphology of a Genre," *Semeia* 14 (1979) 1-19.
Colpe, C., "Das Siegel der Propheten," *Orientalia Suecana* 33-35 (1984-86) 71-83.
Copenhaver, B.P., *Hermetica: The Greek Corpus Hermeticum and the Latin Asclepius in a New English Translation* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992).
Couliano, I.P., *The Tree of Gnosis: Gnostic Mythology from Early Christianity to Modern Nihilism* (San Francisco: HarperCollins, 1992).
Coyle, J.K., "The Cologne Mani-Codex and Mani's Christian Connections," *Église et théologie* 10 (1979) 179-93.
Cross, F.M., *The Ancient Library of Qumran & Modern Biblical Studies* (rev. ed.; reprinted, Grand Rapids, MI: Baker, 1980).
—, *Canaanite Myth and Hebrew Epic: Essays in the History of the Religion of Israel* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1973).

Cumont, F., and Kugener, M.-A., *Recherches sur le manichéisme* (Bruxelles: H. Lamertin, 1908-12).
Dan, J., "Eleazar ben Judah of Worms," *EncJud* 6.592-94.
Delcor, M., *Les hymnes de Qumran (Hodayot)* (Paris: Letouzey et Ané, 1962).
Denis, A.-M., *Introduction aux pseudépigraphes grecs d'Ancien Testament* (SVTP 1; Leiden: Brill, 1970).
Di Lella, A.A., "Qumrân and the Geniza Fragments of Sirach," *CBQ* 24 (1962) 245-67.
Dillmann, A., *Das Buch Henoch* (Leipzig: F.C.W. Vogel, 1853).
—, *Liber Henoch, Aethiopice ad quinque codicum fidem editus* (Leipzig: F.C.G. Vogel, 1851).
Dodge, B., *The Fihrist of al-Nadīm* (2 vols.; New York: Columbia University Press, 1970).
Donadoni, S., "Un frammento della versione copta del 'Libro di Enoch'," *AcOr* 25 (1960) 197-202.
Doresse, J., *The Secret Books of the Egyptian Gnostics* (reprinted, Rochester, VT: Inner Traditions, 1986).
Drijvers, H.J.W., "Bardaiṣan of Edessa and the Hermetica: The Aramaic Philosopher and the Philosophy of His Time," *JEOL* 21 (1970) 190-210.
—, "Edessa und jüdische Christentum," *VC* 24 (1970) 4-33.
—, "Mani und Bardaiṣan: ein Beitrag zur Vorgeschichte des Manichäismus," *Mélanges d'histoire des religions offerts à Henri-Charles Puech* (Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 1974) 459-69.
—, "Rechtgläubigkeit und Ketzerei im ältesten syrischen Christentum," *OCA* 197 (1972) 291-308.
Drower, E.S., *The Haran Gawaita and the Baptism of Hibil-Ziwa* (Rome: Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, 1953).
Duchesne-Guillemin, J., *Religion of Ancient Iran* (Bombay: Tata Press, 1973).
Dupont-Sommer, A., *The Essene Writings from Qumran* (reprinted, Gloucester, MA: Peter Smith, 1973).
—, *The Jewish Sect of Qumran and the Essenes: New Studies on the Dead Sea Scrolls* (New York: Macmillan, 1955).
Eissfeldt, O., "Der gegenwärtige Stand der Erforschung der in Palästina neu gefundenen hebräischen Handschriften," *TLZ* 74 (1949) 597-600.
Epiphanius, *Ancoratus und Panarion* (GCS 25, 31, 37; 3 vols.; ed. K. Holl; Leipzig: J.C. Hinrichs, 1915-33).
Epstein, J.N., "Gloses babylo-araméennes," *REJ* 73 (1921) 27-58; 74 (1922) 40-72.
—, "Zum magischen Texte (Journal of the American Oriental Society 1912, p. 434 seq.)," *JAOS* 33 (1913) 279-80.
Erder, Y., "The Origin of the Name Idrīs in the Qur'ān: A Study of the Influence of Qumran Literature on Early Islam," *JNES* 49 (1990) 339-50.
Eusebius, *The Ecclesiastical History* (LCL; 2 vols.; reprinted, Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1964).
—, *Eusebius Werke: Die Praeparatio Evangelica* (GCS 43; 2 vols.; ed. K. Mras; Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1954-56).
Fabricius, J.A., *Codex pseudepigraphus Veteris Testamenti* (2 vols.; Hamburg & Leipzig: Liebezeit, 1713-23).
Fallon, F.T., "The Gnostic Apocalypses," *Semeia* 14 (1979) 123-58.
Festugière, A.-J., *La révélation d'Hermès Trismégiste, I: L'astrologie et les sciences occultes* (2d ed.; Paris: Société d'Édition Les Belles Lettres, 1983).
Fitzmyer, J.A., *The Genesis Apocryphon of Qumran Cave I: A Commentary* (2d rev. ed.; Rome: Biblical Institute Press, 1971).

—, "The Qumran Scrolls, the Ebionites and Their Literature," *Essays on the Semitic Background of the New Testament* (SBLSBS 5; [Missoula, MT]: Scholars Press, 1974) 435-80.
Fitzmyer, J.A., and Harrington, D.J., *A Manual of Palestinian Aramaic Texts* (Rome: Biblical Institute Press, 1978).
Flemming, J., *Das Buch Henoch: Äthiopischer Texte* (TU 7.1; Leipzig: J.C. Hinrichs, 1902).
Flügel, G., *Mani: seine Lehre und seine Schriften* (Leipzig, 1862; reprinted, Osnabrück: Biblio Verlag, 1969).
Forbes, N., and Charles, R.H., "2 Enoch or the Book of the Secrets of Enoch," *APOT* 2.425-69.
Fossum, J.E., "The Magharians: A Pre-Christian Jewish Sect and its Significance for the Study of Gnosticism and Christianity," *Henoch* 9 (1987) 303-44.
—, *The Name of God and the Angel of the Lord* (WUNT 36; Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr, 1985).
Fowden, G., *The Egyptian Hermes: A Historical Approach to the Late Pagan Mind* (Cambridge, 1986; reprinted, Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1993).
—, *Empire to Commonwealth: Consequences of Monotheism in Late Antiquity* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1993).
Fraade, S.D., *Enosh and His Generation: Pre-Israelite Hero and history in Postbiblical Interpretation* (Chico, CA: Scholars Press, 1984).
Frankfurter, D., "Apocalypses Real and Alleged in the Mani Codex," *Numen* (in press).
—, "The Legacy of Jewish Apocalypses in Early Christianity: Regional Trajectories," *The Jewish Apocalyptic Heritage in Early Christianity* (CRINT III.4; ed. J.C. VanderKam and W. Adler; Minneapolis: Fortress, in press) 127-98.
Friedlaender, I., "Jewish-Arabic Studies," *JQR* n.s. 3 (1912-13) 235-300.
Fück, J., "The Arabic Literature on Alchemy According to an-Nadīm (A.D. 987)," *Arabische Kultur und Islam im Mittelalter: Ausgewählte Schriften* (Weimar: H. Böhlaus, 1981) 31-92.
—, "The Originality of the Arabian Prophet," *Studies on Islam* (ed. M.L. Swartz; Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1981) 86-98.
Gardner, I., "A Manichaean Liturgical Codex Found at Kellis," *Or* 62 (1993) 30-59.
Gaster, M., "The Hebrew Text of one of the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs," *Studies and Texts in Folklore, Magic, Mediaeval Romance, Hebrew Apocrypha and Samaritan Archaeology* (3 vols.; reprinted, New York: Ktav, 1971) 1.69-85; 3.22-30 (text).
Gaster, T.H., *The Dead Sea Scriptures* (3d ed.; Garden City, NY: Anchor Books, 1976).
Gaylord, H.E., "How Satanael Lost His '-el'," *JJS* 33 (1982) 303-309.
Georgius Syncellus, *Ecloga Chronographica* (ed. A.A. Mosshammer; Leipzig: B.G. Teubner, 1984).
Gero, S., "With Walter Bauer on the Tigris: Encratite Orthodoxy and Libertine Heresy in Syro-Mesopotamian Christianity," *Nag Hammadi, Gnosticism, and Early Christianity* (ed. C.W. Hedrick and R. Hodgson, Jr.; Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1986) 287-307.
Geiger, A., *Judaism and its History* (2d ed.; New York: Bloch, 1911).
—, "Sadducäer und Pharisäer," *Jüdische Zeitschrift für Wissenschaft und Leben* 2 (1863) 11-54.
Gil, M., "The Creed of Abū 'Āmir," *IOS* 12 (1992) 9-57.
Gimaret, D., and Monnot, G., *Shahrastani: Livre des religions et des sectes I* (Leuven: Peeters/UNESCO, 1986).
Ginzberg, L., "Adam Ḳadmon," *JE* 1.181-83.
—, *The Legends of the Jews* (7 vols.; Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society, 1909-38).

Götze, A., "Die Schatzhöhle: Überlieferung und Quellen," *Sitzungsberichte der Heidelberger Akademie der Wissenschaften, Phil.-hist. Kl.* 4 (1922) 1-92.
Goitein, S.D., *A Mediterranean Society: The Jewish Communities of the Arab World as Portrayed in the Documents of the Cairo Geniza* (6 vols.; Berkeley: University of California Press, 1967-93).
Golb, N., "Who Were the Magārīya?" *JAOS* 80 (1960) 347-59.
—, *Who Wrote the Dead Sea Scrolls? The Search for the Secret of Qumran* (New York: Scribner, 1995).
Goldstein, J.A., *II Maccabees: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary* (AB 41A; Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1983).
Gottheil, R., "Asaph ben Berechiah," *JE* 2.162-63.
—, "References to Zoroaster in Syriac and Arabic Literature," *Classical Studies in Honour of Henry Drisler* (New York: Macmillan and Co., 1894) 24-51.
Greenfield, J.C., "Notes on Some Aramaic and Mandaic Magic Bowls," *JANESCU* 5 (1973) 149-56.
—, "Prolegomenon," *apud* H. Odeberg, *3 Enoch* (reprinted, New York: Ktav, 1973) xi-xlvii.
Greenfield, J.C., and Stone, M.E., "The Enochic Pentateuch and the Date of the Similitudes," *HTR* 70 (1977) 51-65.
—, "Remarks on the Aramaic Testament of Levi from the Geniza," *RB* 86 (1979) 214-30.
Grintz, Y.M., "The Yahad Sectarians, Essenes, Beth(e)sin," *Sinai* 32 (1954) 11-43 (Hebrew).
Gruenwald, I., *Apocalyptic and Merkavah Mysticism* (Leiden: Brill, 1980).
—, "Manichaeism and Judaism in Light of the Cologne Mani Codex," *ZPE* 50 (1983) 29-45.
—, "New Passages from Hekhalot Literature," *Tarbiz* 38 (1968-69) 354-72 (Hebrew).
—, "Re'uyot Yeḥezq'el," *Temirin: Texts and Studies in Kabbala and Hasidism, Volume I* (ed. I. Weinstock; Jerusalem: Mossad Harav Kook, 1972) 101-39 (Hebrew).
Gündüz, S., *The Knowledge of Life: The Origins and Early History of the Mandaeans* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1994).
Guidi, I., ed., *Chronica Minora* (CSCO scrip. syri, ser. III, t. 4; Paris: Reipublicae, 1903).
Gunkel, H., "Der Schreiberengel Nabû im A.T. und im Judentum," *ARW* 1 (1898) 294-300.
Hadassi, Judah ben Elijah, *Sefer Eshkol ha-kopher* (Eupatoria, 1836; reprinted, Westmead: Gregg International Publishers, 1971).
Hallier, L., *Untersuchungen über die Edessenische Chronik* (TU 9.1; Leipzig: J.C. Hinrichs, 1892).
Harkavy, A., "Abū Yūsuf Ya'qūb al-Qirqisānī on the Jewish Sects," *Ya'qūb al-Qirqisānī on Jewish Sects and Christianity: A Translation of "Kitāb al-anwār" Book I, with Two Introductory Essays* (ed. B. Chiesa and W. Lockwood; Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang, 1984) 51-90.
Harnack, A. von, *Marcion: The Gospel of the Alien God* (Durham, NC: Labyrinth Press, 1990).
Hartman, L., *Asking for a Meaning: A Study of 1 Enoch 1-5* (ConBNT 12; Lund: CWK Gleerup, 1979).
Hegemonius, *Acta Archelai* (GCS 16; ed. C.H. Beeson; Leipzig: J.C. Hinrichs, 1906).
Hengel, M., *Judaism and Hellenism* (2d ed.; 2 vols.; Philadelphia: Fortress, 1974).
Hennecke, E., *New Testament Apocrypha* (2 vols.; ed. W. Schneemelcher; Philadelphia: Westminster, 1963-65).
Henning, W.B., "An Astronomical Chapter of the Bundahishn," *JRAS* (1942) 229-48.
—, "The Book of the Giants," *BSOAS* 11 (1943-46) 52-74.

—, "A List of Middle-Persian and Parthian Words," *BSOS* 9 (1937-39) 79-92.
—, "Ein manichäisches Bet- und Beichtbuch," *APAW* 10 (Berlin, 1936).
—, "Ein manichäisches Henochbuch," *SPAW* (1934) 27-35.
—, Review of Jackson, *Researches in Manichaeism*, in *OLZ* 37 (1934) 749-56.
—, "A Sogdian Fragment of the Manichaean Cosmogony," *BSOAS* 12 (1947-48) 306-18.
—, "Two Manichaean Magical Texts, with an Excursus on the Parthian Ending *-ēndēh*," *BSOAS* 12 (1947-48) 39-66.
Henrichs, A., "The Cologne Mani Codex Reconsidered," *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology* 83 (1979) 339-67.
—, "Literary Criticism of the Cologne Mani Codex," *The Rediscovery of Gnosticism: Proceedings of the International Conference on Gnosticism at Yale, New Haven, Connecticut, March 28-31, 1978* (2 vols.; ed. B. Layton; Leiden: Brill, 1981) 2.724-33.
—, "Mani and the Babylonian Baptists: A Historical Confrontation," *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology* 77 (1973) 23-59.
Henrichs, A., and Koenen, L., "Ein griechischer Mani-Codex (P. Colon. inv. nr. 4780)," *ZPE* 5 (1970) 97-217.
—, " ... Edition der Seiten 1-72," *ZPE* 19 (1975) 1-85.
—, " ... Edition der Seiten 72,8-99,9," *ZPE* 32 (1978) 87-199.
—, " ... Edition der Seiten 99,10-120," *ZPE* 44 (1981) 201-318.
—, " ... Edition der Seiten 121-192," *ZPE* 48 (1982) 1-59.
Hespel, R., and Draguet, R., *Théodore bar Koni: Livre des Scolies (recension de Séert) II. Mimrè VI-XI* (CSCO 432, scrip. syri t. 188; Louvain: Peeters, 1982).
Higger, M., "Pirqey de-Rabbi Eliezer," *Horeb* 8 (1944) 82-119; 9 (1946) 94-165; 10 (1948) 185-294.
Hilgenfeld, A., "Elxai libri fragmenta collecta, digesta, diiudicata," *Hermae Pastor graece e codicibus Sinaitico et Lipsiensi ...* (2d ed.; Leipzig: T.O. Weigl, 1881) 229-40.
Himmelfarb, M., *Ascent to Heaven in Jewish and Christian Apocalypses* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1993).
—, "Heavenly Ascent and the Relationship of the Apocalypses and the *Hekhalot* Literature," *HUCA* 59 (1988) 73-100.
—, "Revelation and Rapture: The Transformation of the Visionary in the Ascent Apocalypses," *Mysteries and Revelations: Apocalyptic Studies since the Uppsala Colloquium* (JSPSup 9; ed. J.J. Collins and J.H. Charlesworth; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1991) 79-90.
—, "Some Echoes of *Jubilees* in Medieval Hebrew Literature," *Tracing the Threads: Studies in the Vitality of Jewish Pseudepigrapha* (SBLEJL 6; ed. J.C. Reeves; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1994) 115-41.
Hindley, J.C., "Towards a Date for the Similitudes of Enoch: A Historical Approach," *NTS* 14 (1967-68) 551-65.
Holmes, S., "The Wisdom of Solomon," *APOT* 1.518-68.
Hopkins, S., *A Miscellany of Literary Pieces from the Cambridge Genizah Collection* (Cambridge University Library Genizah Series 3; Cambridge: Cambridge University Library, 1978).
Horst, P.W. van der, and Mansfeld, J., *An Alexandrian Platonist Against Dualism: Alexander of Lycopolis' Treatise "Critique of the Doctrines of Manichaeus"* (Leiden: Brill, 1974).
Hultgård, A., "Das Judentum in der hellenistisch-römischen Zeit und die iranische Religion: ein religionsgeschichtliches Problem," *ANRW* II.19.1 (Berlin: W. de Gruyter, 1979) 512-90.
Humphries, R.S., *Islamic History: A Framework for Inquiry* (rev. ed.; Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1991).

Hutter, M., "Manichaeism in the Early Sasanian Empire," *Numen* 40 (1993) 2-15.
—, *Manis kosmogonische Šābuhragān-Texte: Edition, Kommentar und literaturgeschichtliche Einordung der manichäisch-mittelpersischen Handschriften M 98/99 I und M 7980-7984* (Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz, 1992).
Idel, M., *Kabbalah: New Perspectives* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1988).
Isaac, E., "1 (Ethiopic Apocalypse of) Enoch," *OTP* 1.5-89.
Jackson, A.V.W., *Researches in Manichaeism* (New York, 1932; reprinted, New York: AMS Press, 1965).
James, M.R., "A Fragment of the Apocalypse of Adam in Greek," *Apocrypha Anecdota: A Collection of Thirteen Apocryphal Books and Fragments* (TextS 2.3; Cambridge: University Press, 1893) 138-45.
—, *The Lost Apocrypha of the Old Testament: Their Titles and Fragments* (London: SPCK, 1920).
—, *The Testament of Abraham* (TextS 2.2; Cambridge: University Press, 1892).
Jellinek, A., ed., *Bet ha-Midrasch* (6 vols.; reprinted, Jerusalem: Bamberger & Wahrmann, 1938).
Jolivet, J., and Rashed, R., "Al-Kindī, Abū Yūsuf Ya'qūb b. Isḥāḳ," *EI*^{2} 5.122-23.
Jones, F.S., Review of Luttikhuizen, *The Revelation of Elchasai*, in *JAC* 30 (1987) 200-209.
Jonge, M. de, "The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs," *AOT* (Sparks) 505-600.
—, *The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs: A Critical Edition of the Greek Text* (PVTG 1.2; Leiden: Brill, 1978).
Kahle, P., *The Cairo Genizah* (2d ed.; Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1959).
Kessler, K., *Mani: Forschungen über die manichäische Religion* (Berlin: G. Reimer, 1889).
Kisā'ī (al-), Muḥammad ibn 'Abd Allāh, *Qiṣaṣ al-anbiyā'* (2 vols.; ed. I. Eisenberg; Leiden: Brill, 1922-23).
Klijn, A.F.J., *Seth in Jewish, Christian and Gnostic Literature* (NovTSup 46; Leiden: Brill, 1977).
Klijn, A.F.J., and Reinink, G.J., *Patristic Evidence for Jewish-Christian Sects* (NovTSup 36; Leiden: Brill, 1973).
Klimkeit, H.-J., *Gnosis on the Silk Road: Gnostic Texts from Central Asia* (San Francisco: HarperSanFrancisco, 1993).
—, *Hymnen und Gebete der Religion des Lichts: Iranische und türkische liturgische Texte der Manichäer Zentralasiens* (Opladen: Westdeutscher Verlag, 1989).
Kmosko, M., "Testamentum patris nostri Adam," *Patrologia Syriaca* (3 vols.; ed. R. Graffin; Paris: Firmin-Didot, 1894-1926) 2.1306-60.
Knibb, M.A., "The Date of the Parables of Enoch: A Critical Review," *NTS* 25 (1979) 345-59.
—, *The Ethiopic Book of Enoch* (2 vols.; Oxford: Clarendon, 1978).
—, "1 Enoch," *AOT* (Sparks) 169-319.
Kobelski, P.J., *Melchizedek and Melchireša'* (Washington, DC: Catholic Biblical Association of America, 1981).
Köbert, R., "Orientalische Bemerkungen zum Kölner Mani-Codex," *ZPE* 8 (1971) 243-47.
Koenen, L., "Augustine and Manichaeism in Light of the Cologne Mani Codex," *Illinois Classical Studies* 3 (1978) 154-95.
—, "Manichaean Apocalypticism at the Crossroads of Iranian, Egyptian, Jewish and Christian Thought," *Codex Manichaicus Coloniensis: Atti del Simposio Internazionale (Rende-Amantea 3-7 settembre 1984)* (ed. L. Cirillo and A. Roselli; Cosenza: Marra Editore, 1986) 285-332.

—, "Manichäische Mission und Klöster in Ägypten," *Das römisch-byzantinische Ägypten: Akten des internationalen Symposions 26.-30. September 1978 in Trier* (Mainz am Rhein: Von Zabern, 1983) 93-108.
—, "Zu Herkunft des Kölner Mani-Codex," *ZPE* 11 (1973) 240-41.
Koenen, L., and Römer, C., *Der Kölner Mani-Kodex: Abbildungen und diplomatischer Text* (Bonn: Habelt, 1985).
—, *Der Kölner Mani-Kodex: Kritische Edition* (Opladen: Westdeutscher Verlag, 1988).
Koester, H., "GNOMAI DIAPHOROI: The Origin and Nature of Diversification in the History of Early Christianity," *HTR* 58 (1965) 279-318.
Kolenkow, A.B., "The Genre Testament and Forecasts of the Future in the Hellenistic Jewish Milieu," *JSJ* 6 (1975) 57-71.
—, "The Literary Genre 'Testament'," *Early Judaism and its Modern Interpreters* (ed. R.A. Kraft and G.W.E. Nickelsburg; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1986) 259-67.
Kotter, B., ed., *Die Schriften des Johannes von Damaskos IV: Liber de haeresibus. Opera polemica* (Patristische Texte und Studien 22; Berlin: W. de Gruyter, 1981).
Kraeling, C.H., *Anthropos and Son of Man* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1927).
Kraft, R.A., "The Pseudepigrapha in Christianity," *Tracing the Threads: Studies in the Vitality of Jewish Pseudepigrapha* (SBLEJL 6; ed. J.C. Reeves; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1994) 55-86.
Lagarde, P.A. de, *Materialen zur Kritik und Geschichte des Pentateuchs* (2 vols.; Leipzig: B.G. Teubner, 1867).
—, *Prophetae Chaldaice: Paulus de Lagarde e fide codicis reuchliniani edidit* (Leipzig: B.G. Teubner, 1872).
Lake, K., trans., *The Apostolic Fathers, Volume II* (LCL 25; reprinted, Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1992).
Lawlor, H.J., "Early Citations from the Book of Enoch," *Journal of Philology* 25 (1897) 164-225.
Layton, B., *The Gnostic Scriptures* (Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1987).
Lazarus-Yafeh, H., *Intertwined Worlds: Medieval Islam and Bible Criticism* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1992).
Lidzbarski, M., *Ginzā: Der Schatz oder das grosse Buch der Mandäer* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1925).
—, *Das Johannesbuch der Mandäer* (2 vols.; Giessen: A. Töpelmann, 1905-15).
—, *Mandäische Liturgien* (Berlin: Weidmannsche Buchhandlung, 1920).
Lieberman, S., *Hellenism in Jewish Palestine* (2d ed.; New York: Jewish Theological Seminary of America, 1962).
Lieu, S.N.C., *Manichaeism in the Later Roman Empire and Medieval China* (2d ed.; Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr, 1992).
Lipiński, E., "El's Abode: Mythological Traditions Related to Mount Hermon and to the Mountains of Armenia," OLP 2 (1971) 13-69.
Luria, D., ed., *Sefer Pirqey Rabbi Eliezer ha-Gadol* (Warsaw, 1852; reprinted, Jerusalem: [s.n.], 1970).
Luttikhuizen, G.P., *The Revelation of Elchasai* (Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr, 1985).
MacKenzie, D.N., "Mani's Šābuhragān," *BSOAS* 42 (1979) 500-534; 43 (1980) 288-310.
MacRae, G.W., "Apocalypse of Adam," *OTP* 1.707-19.
Mann, J., *Texts and Studies in Jewish History and Literature* (2 vols.; Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society, 1931-35).
Margalioth, M., ed., *Sefer ha-Razim: A Newly Recovered Book of Magic from the Talmudic Period* (Jerusalem: American Academy for Jewish Research, 1966).
Margoliouth, D.S., "Ḥarranians," *ERE* 6.519-20.

Markon, I., *Commentarius in librum duodecim prophetarium quem composuit Daniel al-Ḳūmissi* (Jerusalem: Mekitze Nirdamim, 1957).
Mas'ūdī (al-), Abū al-Ḥasan 'Alī ibn al-Ḥusayn ibn 'Alī, *Murūj al-dhahab wa-ma'ādin al-jawhar: Les prairies d'or* (9 vols.; ed. C. Barbier de Meynard and P. de Courteille; Paris: Imprimerie impériale, 1861-77).
Massignon, L., "Inventaire de la littérature hermétique arabe," *apud* A.-J. Festugière, *La révélation d'Hermès Trismégiste, I: L'astrologie et les sciences occultes* (2d ed.; reprinted, Paris: Société d'Édition Les Belles Lettres, 1983) 384-400.
Mathews, E.G., Jr., and Amar, J.P., *St. Ephrem the Syrian: Selected Prose Works* (FC 91; ed. K. McVey; Washington, DC: The Catholic University of America Press, 1994).
Metzger, B.M., *The Early Versions of the New Testament: Their Origin, Transmission, and Limitations* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1977).
Milik, J.T., *The Books of Enoch: Aramaic Fragments of Qumrân Cave 4* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1976).
—, "Fragments grecs du livre d'Hénoch (P. Oxy. xvii 2069)," *Chronique d'Égypte* 46 (1971) 321-43.
—, "*Milkî-ṣedeq* et *Milkî-reša'* dans les anciens écrits juifs et chrétiens," *JJS* 23 (1972) 95-144.
—, "Notes d'épigraphie et de topographie palestiniennes. 8. Traité des vases (מסכת כלים)," *RB* 66 (1959) 567-75.
—, "4Q Visions de 'Amram et une citation d'Origène," *RB* 79 (1972) 77-97.
—, "Le rouleau de cuivre provenant de la grotte 3Q (3Q15)," *apud* DJD III.1 211-302, 314-17.
—, *Ten Years of Discovery in the Wilderness of Judaea* (SBT 26; Naperville, IL: Alec R. Allenson Inc., 1959).
—, "Le Testament de Lévi en araméen: Fragments de la grotte 4 de Qumrân," *RB* 62 (1955) 398-406.
—, "Turfan et Qumran: Livre des Géants juif et manichéen," *Tradition und Glaube: Das frühe Christentum in seiner Umwelt* (ed. G. Jeremias, H.-W. Kuhn, and H. Stegemann; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1971) 117-27.
Millar, F., *The Roman Near East, 31 BC - AD 337* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1993).
Mingana, A., "Some Early Judaeo-Christian Documents in the John Rylands University Library: Syriac Texts," *BJRL* 4 (1917-18) 59-118.
Mitchell, C.W., ed., *S. Ephraem's Prose Refutations of Mani, Marcion, and Bardaisan* (2 vols.; London: Williams and Norgate, 1912-21).
Monneret de Villard, U., *Le leggende orientali sui Magi evangelici* (Rome: Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, 1952).
Monnot, G., "Les écrits musulmans sur les religions non-bibliques," *Islam et religions* (Paris: Éditions Maisonneuve et Larose, 1986) 39-82.
—, *Penseurs musulmans et religions iraniennes: 'Abd al-Jabbār et ses devanciers* (Paris: J. Vrin, 1974).
—, "Sabéens et idolâtres selon 'Abd al-Jabbār," *Islam et religions* 207-37.
Montgomery, J.A., *Aramaic Incantation Texts from Nippur* (Philadelphia: The University Museum, 1913).
—, "A Magical Bowl-Text and the Original Script of the Manichaeans," *JAOS* 32 (1912) 433-38.
Morfill, W.R., and Charles, R.H., *The Book of the Secrets of Enoch* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1896).
Morray-Jones, C.R.A., "Transformational Mysticism in the Apocalyptic-Merkabah Tradition," *JJS* 43 (1992) 1-31.

Moses Khorenats'i, *History of the Armenians* (ed. R.W. Thomson; Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1978).
Müntner, S., "Asaph ha-Rofe," *EncJud* 3.673-76.
—, *Mavo' le-sefer Asaf ha-Rofe'* (Jerusalem: Geniza, 1957).
Nau, F., "Apotelesmata Apollonii Tyanensis," *Patrologia Syriaca* (3 vols.; ed. R. Graffin; Paris: Firmin-Didot, 1894-1926) 2.1363-85.
Naveh, J., and Shaked, S., *Amulets and Magic Bowls: Aramaic Incantations of Late Antiquity* (Jerusalem: Magnes Press, 1985).
—, *Magic Spells and Formulae: Aramaic Incantations of Late Antiquity* (Jerusalem: Magnes Press, 1993).
Nemoy, L., "Al-Qirqisānī's Account of the Jewish Sects and Christianity," *HUCA* 7 (1930) 317-97.
Netton, I.R., *Muslim Neoplatonists: An Introduction to the Thought of the Brethren of Purity (Ikhwān al-Ṣafā')* (London: George Allen & Unwin, 1982).
Netzer, A., "The Story of Adam in the Bereshit-Nāmah of Shāhīn," *Proceedings of the First European Conference of Iranian Studies, Part 2: Middle and New Iranian Studies* (ed. G. Gnoli and A. Panaino; Rome: Istituto italiano per il medio ed estremo oriente, 1990) 497-509.
Neubauer, A., *Mediaeval Jewish Chronicles and Chronological Notes* (2 vols.; reprinted, Amsterdam: Philo Press, 1970).
Newsom, C., *Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice: A Critical Edition* (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1985).
Nickelsburg, G.W.E., *Jewish Literature Between the Bible and the Mishnah: A Historical and Literary Introduction* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1981).
Nöldeke, T., "Die Namen der aramäischen Nation und Sprache," *ZDMG* 25 (1871) 113-31.
—, Review of Pognon, *Inscriptions mandaïtes ...*, in *WZKM* 12 (1898) 353-61.
Olyan, S.M., *A Thousand Thousands Served Him: Exegesis and the Naming of Angels in Ancient Judaism* (Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr, 1993).
Overbeck, J.J., ed., *S. Ephraemi Syri ... Opera Selecta* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1865).
Pass, H.L., and Arendzen, J., "Fragment of an Aramaic Text of the Testament of Levi," *JQR* o.s. 12 (1899-1900) 651-61.
Paul, A., *Écrits de Qumran et sectes juives aux premiers siècles de l'Islam* (Paris: Letouzey et Ané, 1969).
Pearson, B.A., "The Figure of Melchizedek in Gnostic Literature," *Gnosticism, Judaism, and Egyptian Christianity* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1990) 108-23.
—, "The Figure of Seth in Gnostic Literature," *Gnosticism, Judaism, and Egyptian Christianity* 52-83.
—, "The Figure of Seth in Manichaean Literature," *Manichaean Studies: Proceedings of the First International Conference on Manichaeism* (ed. P. Bryder; Lund: Plus Ultra, 1988) 147-55.
—, "Jewish Sources in Gnostic Literature," *Jewish Writings of the Second Temple Period* (CRINT II.2; ed. M.E. Stone; Philadelphia & Assen: Fortress & Van Gorcum, 1984) 443-81.
—, "The Problem of 'Jewish Gnostic' Literature," *Nag Hammadi, Gnosticism, and Early Christianity* (ed. C.W. Hedrick and R. Hodgson, Jr.; Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1986) 15-35.
Pellat, C., ed., *Les prairies d'or* (5 vols.; Paris: Société asiatique, 1962-).
—, "Le témoignage d'al-Jāḥiẓ sur les manichéens," *The Islamic World From Classical to Modern Times: Essays in Honor of Bernard Lewis* (ed. C.E. Bosworth, et al.; Princeton, NJ: Darwin Press, 1989) 269-79.
Pennington, A., "The Apocalypse of Abraham," *AOT* (Sparks) 363-91.

—, "2 Enoch," *AOT* (Sparks) 321-62.
Perkins, P., "Apocalypse of Adam: Genre and Function of a Gnostic Apocalypse," *CBQ* 39 (1977) 382-95.
Peters, F.E., "Hermes and Harran: The Roots of Arabic-Islamic Occultism," *Intellectual Studies on Islam: Essays Written in Honor of Martin B. Dickson* (ed. M.M. Mazzaoui and V.B. Moreen; Salt Lake City: University of Utah Press, 1990) 185-215.
Peterson, E., "Urchristentum und Mandäismus," *ZNW* 27 (1928) 55-98.
Philonenko, M., "Une citation manichéenne du livre d'Hénoch," *RHPR* 52 (1972) 337-40.
Pines, S., "Enoch, Slavonic Book of," *EncJud* 6.797-99.
—, "Eschatology and the Concept of Time in the Slavonic Book of Enoch," *Types of Redemption: Contributions to the Theme of the Study Conference Held at Jerusalem 14th to 19th July 1968* (ed. R.J.Z. Werblowsky and C.J. Bleeker; Leiden: Brill, 1970) 72-87.
Plessner, M., "Hirmis," *EI*^{2} 3.463-65.
Pognon, H., *Inscriptions mandaïtes des coupes de Khouabir* (Paris, 1898; reprinted, Amsterdam: Philo Press, 1979).
Poznanski, S., "Anan et ses écrits," *REJ* 44 (1902) 161-87; 45 (1902) 50-69; 176-203.
Preisendanz, K., ed., *Papyri Graecae Magicae: Die griechischen Zauberpapyri* (2d ed.; 2 vols.; ed. A. Henrichs; Stuttgart: B.G. Teubner, 1973-74).
Prigent, P., and Kraft, R.A., *Épître de Barnabé* (SC 172; Paris: Cerf, 1971).
Puech, E., "Fragments d'un apocryphe de Lévi et le personnage eschatologique: 4QTestLévi^{c-d}(?) et 4QAJa," *The Madrid Qumran Congress: Proceedings of the International Congress on the Dead Sea Scrolls, Madrid 18-21 March, 1991* (2 vols.; ed. J. Trebolle Barrera and L. Vegas Montaner; Leiden: Brill, 1992) 2.449-501.
—, "Notes sur le manuscrit de XIQ Melkisedeq," *RevQ* 12 (1987) 483-513.
Puech, H.-C., *En quête de la gnose* (2 vols.; Paris: Gallimard, 1978).
—, "Fragments retrouvés de l'«Apocalypse d'Allogène»," *Annuaire de l'institut de philologie et d'histoire orientales et slaves (Bruxelles)* 4 (1936) 935-62.
—, *Le manichéisme: son fondateur - sa doctrine* (Paris: Civilisations du Sud, 1949).
—, "Saint Paul chez les manichéens d'Asie centrale," *Proceedings of the IXth International Congress for the History of Religions, Tokyo and Kyoto 1958* (Tokyo: Maruzen, 1960) 176-87.
Puech, H.-C., and Quispel, G., "Les écrits gnostiques du Codex Jung," *VC* 8 (1954) 1-51.
Qimron, E., *The Hebrew of the Dead Sea Scrolls* (HSS 29; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1986).
Qirqisānī (al-), Ya'qūb, *Kitāb al-anwār wa-l-marāqib* (5 vols.; ed. L. Nemoy; New York: Alexander Kohut Memorial Foundation, 1939-43).
Reeves, J.C., "The 'Elchasaite' Sanhedrin of the Cologne Mani Codex in Light of Second Temple Jewish Sectarian Sources," *JJS* 42 (1991) 68-91.
—, "An Enochic Citation in *Barnabas* 4:3 and the *Oracles of Hystaspes*," *Pursuing the Text: Studies in Honor of Ben Zion Wacholder on the Occasion of his Seventieth Birthday* (JSOTSup 184; ed. J.C. Reeves and J. Kampen; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1994) 260-77.
—, "An Enochic Motif in Manichaean Tradition," *Manichaica Selecta: Studies Presented to Professor Julien Ries on the Occasion of his Seventieth Birthday* (ed. A. van Tongerloo and S. Giversen; Louvain: International Association of Manichaean Studies, 1991) 295-98.
—, *Jewish Lore in Manichaean Cosmogony: Studies in the Book of Giants Traditions* (Cincinnati: Hebrew Union College Press, 1992).

—, "Jewish Pseudepigrapha in Manichaean Literature: The Influence of the Enochic Library," *Tracing the Threads: Studies in the Vitality of Jewish Pseudepigrapha* (SBLEJL 6; ed. J.C. Reeves; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1994) 173-203.
—, "Manichaean Citations from the Prose Refutations of Ephrem," *Emerging From the Darkness* (ed. J. BeDuhn, forthcoming).
—, "Manichaica Aramaica: Adam, Seth, and Magical Praxis," (forthcoming).
—, "The Meaning of *Moreh Ṣedeq* in the Light of 11QTorah," *RevQ* 13 (1988) 287-98.
—, "Theodore bar Konai and Syro-Mesopotamian Gnosis," *ANRW* (forthcoming).
—, "Utnapishtim in the Book of Giants?" *JBL* 112 (1993) 110-15.
Reinink, G.J., "Das Problem des Ursprungs des Testamentes Adams," *OCA* 197 (1972) 387-99.
Reitzenstein, R., *Hellenistic Mystery-Religions: Their Basic Ideas and Significance* (3d ed.; Pittsburgh, PA: The Pickwick Press, 1978).
—, *Das mandäische Buch des Herrn der Grösse und die Evangelienüberlieferung* (Heidelberg: C. Winter, 1919).
Reitzenstein, R., and Schaeder, H.H., *Studien zum antike Synkretismus aus Iran und Griechenland* (Leipzig: B.G. Teubner, 1926).
Revel, B., "Inquiry into the Sources of Karaite Halakah," *JQR* n.s. 2 (1912) 517-44; 3 (1913) 337-96.
Ri, S.-M., "La Caverne des Trésors et le Testament d'Adam," *OCA* 236 (1990) 111-22.
—, ed., *La Caverne des Trésors: les deux recensions syriaques* (CSCO 486, scrip. syri t. 207; Louvain: E. Peeters, 1987).
—, "La Caverne des Trésors: problèmes d'analyse littéraire," *IV Symposium Syriacum 1984: Literary Genres in Syriac Literature* (*OCA* 229; ed. H.J.W. Drijvers, et al.; Roma: Pont. Institutum Studiorum Orientalium, 1987) 183-90.
Ries, J., *Les études manichéennes: Des controverses de la Réforme aux découvertes du XX^e siècle* (Louvain-la-Neuve: Centre d'histoire des religions, 1988).
Riessler, P., *Altjüdisches Schrifttum ausserhalb der Bibel* (Augsburg: B. Filser Verlag, 1928).
Robinson, J.M., ed., *The Nag Hammadi Library in English* (3d ed.; San Francisco: Harper & Row, 1988).
Robinson, J.M., and Koester, H., *Trajectories Through Early Christianity* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1971).
Robinson, S.E., "Testament of Adam," *OTP* 1.989-95.
—, *The Testament of Adam: An Examination of the Syriac and Greek Traditions* (SBLDS 52; Chico, CA: Scholars Press, 1982).
Rofé, A., "Bat Kol," *EncJud* 4.324-25.
Roncaglia, M.P., "Éléments ébionites et elkésaites dans le Coran: Notes et hypothèses," *Proche-orient chrétien* 21 (1971) 101-26.
Rosenthal, F., *Die aramaistische Forschung seit Th. Nöldeke's Veröffentlichungen* (reprinted, Leiden: Brill, 1964).
Rubin, U., "Prophets and Progenitors in the Early Shī'a Tradition," *Jerusalem Studies in Arabic and Islam* 1 (1979) 41-65.
Rudolph, K., *Antike Baptisten: Zu den Überlieferungen über frühjüdische und -christliche Taufsekten* (Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1981).
—, "Die Bedeutung des Kölner Mani-Codex für die Manichäismusforschung," *Mélanges d'histoire des religions offerts à Henri-Charles Puech* (Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 1974) 471-86.
—, *Gnosis: The Nature and History of Gnosticism* (San Francisco: Harper & Row, 1983).
—, "Ein Grundtyp gnostischer Urmensch-Adam-Spekulation," *ZRGG* 9 (1957) 1-20.
—, *Die Mandäer* (2 vols.; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1960-61).

—, "Mandean Sources," *Gnosis, A Selection of Gnostic Texts II: Coptic and Mandean Sources* (ed. W. Foerster; Oxford: Clarendon, 1974) 123-319.
—, *Theogonie, Kosmogonie und Anthropogonie in den mandäischen Schriften* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1965).
Sachau, C.E., *Alberuni's India* (2 vols.; London, 1888; reprinted, London: K. Paul, Trench, Trubner & Co., Ltd., 1910).
—, *The Chronology of Ancient Nations* (London: W.H. Allen, 1879).
Salmon b. Yeroḥam, *Milḥamot ha-Shem (The Book of the Wars of the Lord)* (ed. I. Davidson; New York: The Jewish Theological Seminary of America, 1934).
Salmond, S.D.F., "The Acts of the Disputation with the Heresiarch Manes," *ANF* 6.179-233.
Schaeder, H.H., *Iranische Beiträge I* (reprinted, Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1972).
—, "Urform und Fortbildungen des manichäischen Systems," *Studien zur orientalischen Religionsgeschichte* (ed. C. Colpe; Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1968) 15-107.
Schäfer, P., ed., *Geniza-Fragmente zur Hekhalot-Literatur* (Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr, 1984).
—, ed., *Synopse zur Hekhalot-Literatur* (Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr, 1981).
Schechter, S., *Documents of Jewish Sectaries, Volume 1: Fragments of a Zadokite Work* (Cambridge, 1910; reprinted, New York: Ktav, 1970).
—, "A Hoard of Hebrew Manuscripts," *Studies in Judaism: Second Series* (Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society, 1908) 1-30.
—, ed., *Massekhet 'Abot de-Rabbi Natan* (Wien: C.D. Lippe, 1887).
Scheftelowitz, I., *Die Entstehung der manichäischen Religion und des Erlösungsmysteriums* (Giessen: A. Töpelmann, 1922).
Schiffman, L.H., *Reclaiming the Dead Sea Scrolls* (Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society, 1994).
Schmidt, C., and MacDermot, V., eds., *The Books of Jeu and the Untitled Text in the Bruce Codex* (NHS 13; Leiden: Brill, 1978).
—, *Pistis Sophia* (NHS 9; Leiden: Brill, 1978).
Schmidt, N., "The Original Language of the Parables of Enoch," *Old Testament and Semitic Studies in Memory of William Rainey Harper* (2 vols.; ed. R.F. Harper, F. Brown, and G.F. Moore; Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1908) 2.329-49.
Scholem, G., "Jaldabaoth Reconsidered," *Mélanges d'histoire des religions offerts à Henri-Charles Puech* (Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 1974) 405-21.
—, *Jewish Gnosticism, Merkabah Mysticism, and Talmudic Tradition* (2d ed.; New York: The Jewish Theological Seminary of America, 1965).
—, *Kabbalah* (Jerusalem: Keter, 1974).
—, *Major Trends in Jewish Mysticism* (3d ed.; reprinted, New York: Schocken, 1978).
—, *Origins of the Kabbalah* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1987).
—, "Shekhinah: The Feminine Element in Divinity," *On the Mystical Shape of the Godhead: Basic Concepts in the Kabbalah* (New York: Schocken, 1991) 140-96.
Schürer, E., *The History of the Jewish People in the Age of Jesus Christ* (rev. ed.; 3 vols. in 4; ed. G. Vermes, F. Millar, and M. Goodman; Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1973-87).
Scopello, M., "Youel et Barbélo dans le traité de l'*Allogène*," *Colloque international sur les textes de Nag Hammadi (Québec, 22-25 août 1978)* (ed. B. Barc; Québec: Les Presses de l'Université Laval, 1981) 374-82.
Scott, W., ed., *Hermetica: The Ancient Greek and Latin Writings Which Contain Religious or Philosophic Teachings Ascribed to Hermes Trismegistus* (4 vols.; Oxford: Clarendon, 1924-36).

Séd, N., *La mystique cosmologique juive* (Paris: Éditions del'École des Hautes Études en Sciences Sociales, 1981).
Sefer Raziel ha-Mal'ak (Calcutta: [s.n.], 1895).
Segal, A.F., *Two Powers in Heaven: Early Rabbinic Reports about Christianity and Gnosticism* (SJLA 25; Leiden: Brill, 1977).
Segelberg, E., "Old and New Testament Figures in Mandaean Version," *Syncretism: Based on Papers read at the Symposium on Cultural Contact, Meeting of Religions, Syncretism held at Åbo on the 8th-10th of September, 1966* (ed. S.S. Hartman; Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell, 1969) 228-39.
Shahrastānī (al-), Abū l-Fatḥ Muḥammad ibn 'Abd al-Qarīm ibn Aḥmad, *Kitāb al-milal wa-al-niḥal* (2 vols.; ed. M.S. Kilani; Beirut: Dar el-Marefah, n.d.).
Shaked, S., "Bagdāna, King of the Demons, and Other Iranian Terms in Babylonian Magic," *Papers in Honour of Mary Boyce* (Acta Iranica 24-25; 2 vols.; Leiden: Brill, 1985) 1.511-25.
—, *Dualism in Transformation: Varieties of Religion in Sasanian Iran* (London: School of Oriental and African Studies, 1994).
Sims-Williams, N., "The Manichaean Commandments: A Survey of the Sources," *Papers in Honour of Professor Mary Boyce* (Acta Iranica 24-25; 2 vols.; Leiden: Brill, 1985) 2.573-82.
Sjöberg, E., *Der Menschensohn im äthiopischen Henochbuch* (Lund: Gleerup, 1946).
Skehan, P.W., and Di Lella, A.A., *The Wisdom of Ben Sira: A New Translation with Notes* (AB 39; New York: Doubleday, 1987).
Sokoloff, M., "Notes on the Aramaic Fragments of Enoch from Qumran Cave 4," *MAARAV* 1/2 (1978-79) 197-224.
Speyer, H., *Die biblischen Erzählungen im Qoran* (reprinted, Hildesheim: Georg Olms, 1988).
Stern, S.M., "'Abd al-Djabbār b. Aḥmad," *EI*^{2} 1.59-60.
Stone, M.E., "Apocalyptic Literature," *Jewish Writings of the Second Temple Period* (CRINT II.2; ed. M.E. Stone; Philadelphia & Assen: Fortress & Van Gorcum, 1984) 383-441.
—, "The Fall of Satan and Adam's Penance: Three Notes on *The Books of Adam and Eve*," *JTS* n.s. 44 (1993) 143-56.
—, *A History of the Literature of Adam and Eve* (SBLEJL 3; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1992).
Stone, M.E., and Greenfield, J.C., "The Prayer of Levi," *JBL* 112 (1993) 247-66.
Strecker, G., "Elkesai," *RAC* 4.1171-86.
—, *Das Judenchristentum in den Pseudoklementinen* (TU 70; 2d ed.; Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1981).
Stroumsa, G.G., *Another Seed: Studies in Gnostic Mythology* (NHS 24; Leiden: Brill, 1984).
—, "Aspects de l'eschatologie manichéenne," *RHR* 198 (1981) 163-81.
—, "The Manichaean Challenge to Egyptian Christianity," *The Roots of Egyptian Christianity* (ed. B.A. Pearson and J.E. Goehring; Philadelphia: Fortress, 1986) 307-19.
—, "Seal of the Prophets: The Nature of the Manichaean Metaphor," *Jerusalem Studies in Arabic and Islam* 7 (1986) 61-74.
—, "Titus of Bostra and Alexander of Lycopolis: A Christian and a Platonic Refutation of Manichaean Dualism," *Neoplatonism and Gnosticism* (ed. R.T. Wallis and J. Bregman; Albany: State University of New York Press, 1992) 337-49.
Sundermann, W., *Mitteliranische manichäische Texte kirchengeschichtlichen Inhalts* (Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1981).

—, *Mittelpersische und parthische kosmogonische und Parabeltexte der Manichäer* (Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1973).
—, "Some More Remarks on Mithra in the Manichaean Pantheon," *Études mithriaques: Actes du 2e Congrès international, Teheran, du 1er au 8 septembre 1975* (Acta Iranica 17; Leiden: Brill, 1978) 485-99.
—, "Studien zur kirchengeschichtlichen Literatur der iranischen Manichäer I," *Altorientalische Forschungen* 13 (1986) 40-92.
Sussmann, Y., "The History of Halakhah and the Dead Sea Scrolls: Preliminary Observations on *Miqṣat Ma'ase Ha-Torah* (4QMMT)," *Tarbiz* 59 (1990) 11-76 (Hebrew).
Ṭabarī (al-), Abū Ja'far Muḥammad ibn Jarīr, *Ta'rīkh ar-rasul wa-l-mulūk (Annales quos scripsit Abu Djafar Mohammed ibn Djarir at-Tabari)* (15 vols.; ed. M.J. De Goeje; Leiden, 1879-1901; reprinted, Leiden: Brill, 1964-65).
Talmon, S., "The 'Desert Motif' in the Bible and in Qumran Literature," *Biblical Motifs: Origins and Transformations* (ed. A. Altmann; Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1966) 31-63.
Tardieu, M., "L'arrivée des manichéens à al-Ḥīra," *La Syrie de Byzance à l'Islam, VIIe-VIIIe siècles* (ed. P. Canivet and J.-P. Rey-Coquais; Damas: Institut française de Damas, 1992) 15-24.
—, "La diffusion du bouddhisme dans l'empire kouchan, l'Iran et la Chine, d'après un kephalaion manichéen inédit," *Studia Iranica* 17 (1988) 153-82.
—, "*Al-ḥikma wa-l-'ilm* dans une citation de Mani chez al-Bīrūnī," *AIUON* 41 (1981) 477-81.
—, "Les livres mis sous le nom de Seth et les Séthiens de l'hérésiologie," *Gnosis and Gnosticism: Papers read at the Seventh International Conference on Patristic Studies (Oxford, September 8th-13th 1975)* (NHS 8; ed. M. Krause; Leiden: Brill, 1977) 204-10.
—, *Le manichéisme* (Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 1981).
Taylor, A.E., *Plato: The Man and his Work* (7th ed.; reprinted, London: Methuen & Co. Ltd., 1977).
Theodore bar Konai, *Liber Scholiorum* (CSCO scrip. syri, ser. II, t. 66; ed. A. Scher; Paris: Carolus Poussielgue, 1912).
Titus of Bostra, *Titi Bostreni contra manichaeos libri quatuor syriace* (ed. P.A. de Lagarde; Berlin: C. Schultze, 1859).
Torrey, C.C., *The Jewish Foundation of Islam* (New York: Jewish Institute of Religion Press, 1933).
Tubach, J., "Spuren des astronomischen Henochbuches bei den Manichäern Mittelasiens," *Nubia et Oriens Christianus: Festschrift für C. Detlef G. Müller zum 60. Geburtstag* (ed. P.O. Scholz and R. Stempel; Köln: J. Dinter, 1988) 73-95.
Turner, J.D., "Sethian Gnosticism: A Literary History," *Nag Hammadi, Gnosticism, and Early Christianity* (ed. C.W. Hedrick and R. Hodgson, Jr.; Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1986) 55-86.
Turner, N., "The Testament of Abraham," *AOT* (Sparks) 393-421.
Ullendorff, E., "An Aramaic 'Vorlage' of the Ethiopic Text of Enoch?" *Atti del convegno internazionale di studi etiopici* (Rome: Accademia nazionale dei Lincei, 1960) 259-67; reprinted in Ullendorff, E., *Is Biblical Hebrew a Language?* (Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz, 1977) 172-81.
Vaillant, A., *Le livre des secrets d'Hénoch: texte slave et traduction française* (Paris: Institut d'études slaves, 1952).
Vajda, G., "Hābīl wa Ḳābīl," *EI*^{2} 3.13-14.
—, "Idrīs," *EI*^{2} 3.1030-31.
—, "Melchisédec dans la mythologie ismaélienne," *JA* 234 (1943-45) 173-83.

—, "Le témoignage d'al-Māturidī sur la doctrine des manichéens, des dayṣānites et des marcionites: Note annexe," *Arabica* 13 (1966) 113-28.
VanderKam, J.C., *The Book of Jubilees: A Critical Text* (CSCO 510, scrip. aeth. 87; Louvain: Peeters, 1989).
—, *The Dead Sea Scrolls Today* (Grand Rapids, MI: William B. Eerdmans, 1994).
—, *Enoch: A Man for All Generations* (Columbia, SC: University of South Carolina Press, 1995).
—, "1 Enoch in Early Christian Literature," *The Jewish Apocalyptic Heritage in Early Christianity* (CRINT III.4; ed. J.C. VanderKam and W. Adler; Minneapolis & Assen: Fortress & Van Gorcum, in press).
Van Lindt, P., *The Names of Manichaean Mythological Figures: A Comparative Study on Terminology in the Coptic Sources* (Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz, 1992).
Vaux, R. de, "A propos des manuscrits de la mer Morte," *RB* 57 (1950) 417-29.
Vermes, G., *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Qumran in Perspective* (rev. ed.; Philadelphia: Fortress, 1981).
—, *The Dead Sea Scrolls in English* (3d ed.; London: Penguin, 1987).
Villey, A., *Alexandre de Lycopolis: Contre la doctrine de Mani* (Paris: Cerf, 1985).
Visotzky, B., "Rabbinic Randglossen to the Cologne Mani Codex," *ZPE* 52 (1983) 295-300.
Wacholder, B.Z., *The Dawn of Qumran: The Sectarian Torah and the Teacher of Righteousness* (Cincinnati: Hebrew Union College Press, 1983).
—, "Pseudo-Eupolemus' Two Greek Fragments on the Life of Abraham," *HUCA* 34 (1963) 83-113.
Wacholder, B.Z., and Abegg, M.G., eds., *A Preliminary Edition of the Unpublished Dead Sea Scrolls: The Hebrew and Aramaic Texts from Cave Four* (Washington, DC: Biblical Archaeology Society, 1991-).
Wagner, S., *Die Essener in der wissenschaftlichen Diskussion vom Ausgang des 18. bis zum Beginn des 20. Jahrhunderts* (BZAW 79; Berlin: W. de Gruyter, 1960).
Wasserstrom, S.M., *Between Muslim and Jew: The Problem of Symbiosis under Early Islam* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1995).
—, "The 'Īsāwiyya Revisited," *Studia Islamica* 75 (1992) 57-80.
—, "Jewish Pseudepigrapha in Muslim Literature: A Bibliographical and Methodological Sketch," *Tracing the Threads: Studies in the Vitality of Jewish Pseudepigrapha* (SBLEJL 6; ed. J.C. Reeves; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1994) 87-114.
—, *Judaism, Islam and Gnosis: Studies in Esotericism* (Albany: SUNY Press, forthcoming).
—, "The Magical Texts in the Cairo Genizah," *Genizah Research After Ninety Years: The Case of Judaeo-Arabic* (ed. J. Blau and S.C. Reif; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992) 160-66.
—, "Recent Works on the 'Creative Symbiosis' of Judaism and Islam," *RelSRev* 16.1 (1990) 43-47.
—, "Sefer Yeṣira and Early Islam: A Reappraisal," *Journal of Jewish Thought and Philosophy* 3 (1993) 1-30.
Welburn, A.J., "Iranian Prophetology and the Birth of the Messiah: The Apocalypse of Adam," *ANRW* II.25.6 (Berlin: W. de Gruyter, 1988) 4752-94.
Wellhausen, J., *Reste arabischen Heidentums* (3d ed.; Berlin, 1927; reprinted, Berlin: W. de Gruyter, 1961).
Wells, L.S.A., "The Books of Adam and Eve," *APOT* 2.123-54.
Widengren, G., *Iranisch-semitische Kulturbegegnung in parthischer Zeit* (Köln & Opladen: Westdeutscher Verlag, 1960).
—, *Mani and Manichaeism* (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1965).
—, ed., *Der Manichäismus* (Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1977).

—, *Mesopotamian Elements in Manichaeism: Studies in Manichaean, Mandaean, and Syrian-Gnostic Religion* (Uppsala: A.-B. Lundequistska Bokhandeln, 1946).
—, *Muhammad, the Apostle of God, and his Ascension* (Uppsala: A.-B. Lundequistska Bokhandeln, 1955).
Wieder, N., *The Judean Scrolls and Karaism* (London: East and West Library, 1962).
Witakowski, W., *The Syriac Chronicle of Pseudo-Dionysius of Tel-Maḥrē: A Study in the History of Historiography* (Studia Semitica Upsaliensia 9; Uppsala: [Uppsala University], 1987).
Woude, A.S. van der, "Melchisedek als himmlische Erlösergestalt in den neugefundenen eschatologischen Midraschim aus Qumran Höhle XI," *OTS* 14 (1965) 354-73.
Ya'qūbī (al-), Aḥmad b. Wāḍiḥ, *Ta'rīkh (Ibn Wadih qui dicitur al-Ja'qubi historiae ...)* (2 vols.; ed. M.T. Houtsma; Leiden: Brill, 1883).
Zaehner, R.C., *The Teachings of the Magi: A Compendium of Zoroastrian Beliefs* (reprinted, New York: Oxford University Press, 1976).

INDEX OF CITATIONS

I. Hebrew Bible

Genesis
1 — 90
1-11 — 7
1:26 — 105, 116
1:26-27 — 68, 105, 119
1:27 — 105
1:28-30 — 107
2-3 — 96
2-4 — 103
2:7 — 68, 172, 173, 181
2:21 — 91
3:6 — 103
3:15 — 104
3:20 — 134
3:21 — 97
3:22 — 97
3:24 — 104
4:1 — 100, 101, 116
4:25 — 36, 103, 113, 114, 117, 119, 127
4:25-26 — 112
4:26 — 37, 38, 121, 142, 155
5:1 — 34, 134
5:1-3 — 103, 125
5:3 — 34, 112, 119, 134
5:3-8 — 112
5:24 — 39, 185, 199
6:1-4 — 36, 134, 138
10:8-11 — 98
11:1-9 — 106
14 — 14, 38, 164
14:18-20 — 73
15:11-21 — 26
15:12 — 91
20:7 — 25
21:19 — 118
25:27 — 54

Exodus
6:20 — 73
19:9 — 180
23:20 — 92
23:20-23 — 71
23:21 — 92, 93
24:15 — 180
40:35-38 — 180

Leviticus
16:12-13 — 180

Numbers
9:15-22 — 180
11:25 — 180
12:5 — 180
12:10 — 180
16:22 — 205
24:17 — 24
27:16 — 205

Deuteronomy
21:13 — 200
30:4 — 203

2 Samuel
22:11 — 203

1 Kings
18:1 — 156
19 — 156

2 Kings
2:11 — 137, 193, 203
6:17 — 118

Isaiah
1:24 — 205
3:1 — 205
6:3 — 205
9:1 — 194
10:16 — 205
10:33 — 205

14:13 — 158
19:4 — 205

Ezekiel
1 — 173, 193
1:4 — 180
1:13-14 — 117-18
1:26 — 170
1:27-28 — 171
1:28 — 170, 171, 172, 173
2:1-2 — 173
8:5 — 133
9:1-2 — 189, 190
9:2 — 189
10 — 173
10:4 — 180

Hosea
3:4 — 50

Amos
5:8 — 156
9:6 — 156

Micah
5:4 — 23
5:11 — 50

Zechariah
2:1 — 133
2:5 — 133
5:1 — 133
5:9 — 133
6:1 — 133

Malachi
3:5 — 50

Psalms
18:12-13 — 180
48:3 — 158
50 — 35
51:19 — 51
73:23-24 — 123
73:24 — 137
78:23 — 180
82 — 42
88:11-13 — 204
92 — 34
104:3 — 203
110 — 14
110:4 — 73
139:16 — 34

Job
10:21 — 194
10:21-22 — 204
21:6 — 200
21:7 — 188
21:7-15 — 187, 188
21:11 — 188
21:14 — 188
21:14-15 — 188

Daniel
5 — 191
5:6 — 191
7 — 200
7:2 — 133
7:7 — 133
7:8 — 200
7:13 — 133
7:25 — 200
8:3 — 133
10:2-5 — 200
10:5 — 133
10:6 — 117
10:10-11 — 191
10:13 — 94, 191
10:20-21 — 94
10:21 — 191
12:1 — 94, 191
12:3 — 136

1 Chronicles
1:1 — 112

II. New Testament

Matthew
17:1 — 149
24:35 — 153
28:3 — 117

Mark
1:11 — 181
9:2 — 149
9:7 — 181
13:31 — 153

Luke
3:38 — 112
9:28 — 149
17:24 — 133

21:33 — 153

John
8:44 — 101
8:56 — 26
14:15ff. — 24
14:16-17 — 160
15:26 — 24, 160
16:7 — 24
16:7-14 — 160
18:1 — 150

Acts
1:9 — 169
7:7 — 26
8:9-10 — 140
8:39 — 150
10:13 — 181

Romans
9:2 — 199

2 Corinthians
11:14 — 73
12:1-4 — 136
12:1-5 — 20

Galatians
1:1 — 20
1:11-12 — 20

Titus
1:5 — 192

Hebrews
7:1-10 — 94

2 Peter
2:5 — 187

1 John
3:12 — 101

Jude
14-15 — 56, 63, 200

Revelation
2-3 — 98
2:7 — 98
4:1 — 169, 170, 181
4:1-2 — 136
4:3 — 171
4:5 — 133
12:7 — 202
12:7-9 — 96

III. Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha

Apocalypse of Abraham
10:4 — 93, 137
10:9 — 92, 93
11-32 — 26
11:1 — 137
13-14 — 96
15:2ff. — 91
15:2-5 — 137
15:3-5 — 95
15:6 — 95
17:11 — 72, 93
20-23 — 96

Syriac Apocalypse of Baruch
6:2-8:3 — 200
9:2-10:1 — 200
51:1-5 — 136
53 — 159

Greek Apocalypse of Baruch
1:1-3 — 200
4:16 — 97
11-17 — 202

Apocalypse of Moses
1:3 — 101
10:3 — 134
13:2-6 — 138
20:1-2 — 97
21:6 — 97
29:4 — 72
33:5 — 72

Ascension of Isaiah
7:2 — 133
7:3-9 — 123
7:5 — 192
7:8 — 192
9:7-9 — 133

Assumption of Moses
1:16-18 — 95

Ben Sira
44:16 — 185

1 Enoch
1-5 — 56
1-36 — 39, 56
1:1-32:6 — 56
1:2 — 24, 184, 187, 196
1:9 — 186, 187, 200
5:4 — 199
6-11 — 56
6-16 — 156, 191, 202
6-36 — 56
6:1-7 — 56
6:1-10:14 — 56
6:7 — 133
7-8 — 103
8:3 — 133
9-10 — 190
9:1 — 192, 200, 202
10:4-6 — 195
10:9 — 177
13:4 — 201
14:8 — 192
14:8-9 — 123
14:15 — 169
14:20 — 171
15-16 — 165
15:8-16:1 — 56, 176
16:1 — 177
17:2 — 149, 157
18:6-9 — 148
19:3-21:9 — 56
20:1-7 — 190
21-36 — 148, 191
22:1-5 — 148
22:2 — 194, 195
22:9 — 195
24-25 — 148
24:3 — 170
24:6-25:7 — 192
25:5 — 150
32:1-3 — 148
32:3 — 203
34:1 — 151
36:2 — 203
37-69 — 204
37-71 — 39, 192, 197
39 — 204
39-41 — 195
39:3 — 137, 192, 193, 203
39:3-5 — 193
39:4-5 — 193, 204
39:12 — 205
40:2 — 204
40:2-10 — 200
41:2 — 194
41:5-9 — 195
41:8-9 — 204
52:1 — 192, 203
52:1-2 — 137
54:1-2 — 194
54:5-6 — 195
54:7-55:2 — 56
56:5 — 206
56:5-7 — 198
58:2-6 — 195
60 — 56
60:4-6 — 192
60:7-10 — 206
60:11 — 203
60:23 — 203
61:1-5 — 151
63:6 — 194
65-69:25 — 56
65:9 — 137
67:4-7 — 195
68:4-5 — 201
70-71 — 192, 197, 204
70:2 — 192
70:2-3 — 151
70:3-4 — 133
71 — 195, 204
71:1-14 — 136
71:3 — 123, 193, 194, 204
71:3-4 — 193
71:4 — 195, 203
71:9 — 200
72-82 — 39, 56, 205
77:3 — 203
77:4 — 148
77:7 — 151
83-90 — 39, 56
85-90 — 52, 126, 190
85:3-4 — 101
87:2 — 190
89:42-49 — 56
90:21-22 — 190
91-105 — 39
91-107 — 56
92:1 — 24
93:3-8 — 56
97:6-104:13 — 56
103:7-8 — 195
103:8 — 195
106-107 — 39, 56
106:1-7 — 102

106:1-18 — 56
106:1-107:3 — 56
106:2 — 103
106:19 — 196
108 — 39-40
108:11-15 — 196

2 Enoch (short version)
prologue — 184
5:11-13 — 195
6 — 195
9:17-19 — 97
9:19 — 40
10:2 — 55
10:5-7 — 55
11:25 — 49
11:27 — 49
11:29 — 37, 49
11:36-37 — 57
13-18 — 41
13:27 — 95, 196, 203, 204

2 Enoch (long version)
22:4-12 — 136
29:4-5 — 96
30:11-12 — 96
31:3-6 — 96
31:4-5 — 96
33:10 — 155
57:2 — 57

3 Enoch (ed. Schäfer)
§§1-2 — 181
§5 — 57, 200
§§7-8 — 155
§10 — 203
§15 — 93
§21 — 201
§59 — 137
§76 — 93

4 Ezra
3:15 — 26
5:13 — 200
5:20 — 200
6:35 — 200

Jubilees
4:1 — 101
4:9 — 101
4:17-23 — 146
4:17-24 — 196
4:21 — 196
4:31 — 102
7:1 — 55
7:38 — 49
10 — 55
10:1-14 — 165, 176
10:13-14 — 38
10:14 — 49, 164
12:27 — 49, 54, 176
14:13 — 91
17:12 — 133
19:24 — 164
21:10 — 49, 54, 176

2 Maccabees
3:24 — 205

Odes of Solomon
11:16 — 196
14:4 — 138

Pseudo-Philo, *Biblical Antiquities*
26:12 — 93

Testament of Abraham (A)
11:4-5 — 133
11:9-10 — 133
16-20 — 122, 146

Testament of Abraham (B)
8:5-16 — 133
12-14 — 146

Testament of Adam
3:5 — 101

Testament of Benjamin
10:6 — 176

Testament of Dan
5:6 — 185

Testament of Job
25:2 — 170

Testament of Judah
18:1 — 185
20:1-5 — 161
23:1 — 185, 186

Testament of Levi
2:5-6 — 149

6:1 — 158
8:1ff. — 190, 191
10:5 — 185

Testament of Naphtali (Hebrew)
8:6 — 176

Tobit
3:6 — 185
12:15 — 201

Vita Adae et Evae (Latin)
9:1 — 94
13:1-14:3 — 96
13:2-16:4 — 72
16:1 — 96
18:4 — 101
21:1-3 — 72
21:3 — 101, 103
22:2 — 72
25:1-29:10 — 52
25:2-3 — 95, 193
25:2-29:1 — 72
37:3 — 134
41:1-43:2 — 72, 138
46:2-48:7 — 72
48:6 — 104
49-51 — 54
49:2-3 — 72
50:1-2 — 95
51:1-2 — 72

Vita Adae et Evae (Slavonic)
31:2 — 73
32:2-3 — 73

Wisdom of Solomon
4:7 — 185
4:10-11 — 185

IV. Qumran Literature

Damascus Covenant (CD)
1:12 — 24
3:20 — 97
5:17-19 — 94
6:19 — 44
10:6 — 53
13:2 — 53

Genesis Apocryphon (1QapGen)
2-5 — 39
2:1-7 — 102
2:14-18 — 102
2:19-21 — 102

1Q *Hodayot* (1QH)
3:19-22 — 124, 136, 148
3:20 — 157
10:8 — 205
17:15 — 97

1Q *Milḥamah* (1QM)
9:14-16 — 192
9:15 — 200
13:9-10 — 94
13:10 — 161
17:6-7 — 191

1Q *Pesher Habakkuk* (1QpHab)
2:7 — 24
7:2 — 24

1Q *Serek ha-Yaḥad* (1QS)
1:8 — 137
1:10 — 137
2:8 — 204
2:25 — 137
3:18 — 161
3:20 — 94
4:7-8 — 204
4:12-13 — 204
4:21 — 161
4:23 — 97, 161
5:7 — 137
6:7 — 53
7:22 — 137
8:5 — 137
8:15-16 — 24
8:22 — 137

1QSa
1:7 — 53
1:27 — 137
2:2 — 137
2:9 — 137
2:11 — 137

1QSb
5:23 — 157

1Q*14* — 24
1Q*19* — 56
3Q*15* — 152

4Q'Amram (4Q*543-548*) — 73, 74, 94, 171, 180
4QEn^{a} — 24
4QEn^{b} — 202
4QEn^{c} — 205
4QShirShabb — 190
4QTLevi^{a} (4Q*213*) — 149, 158
4Q*266* — 203
4Q*417* — 37
4Q*504* — 97
4Q*510* — 177
4Q*511* — 177
11QMelch — 73
11QPs^{a} — 60

V. Rabbinic Literature

Mishnah
Yoma 5:1 — 61
Ḥagiga 2:1 — 145
Ḥagiga 2:4 — 61
Sanhedrin 10:3 — 200
Menaḥot 10:3 — 61
Para 3:7 — 61

Tosefta
Yoma 1.8 — 61
Roš Haššana 1.15 — 61
Soṭa 3.6-7 — 200
Sanhedrin 8.3 — 52
Sanhedrin 8.7 — 90

Babylonian Talmud (Bavli)
Šabbat 55a — 189, 201
Šabbat 108a — 61
Yoma 9b — 180
Sukka 52b — 23, 94
Roš Haššana 22b — 61
Megilla 3a — 180
Ḥagiga 12b — 95, 202
Ḥagiga 14b — 180
Nedarim 32b — 28, 55
Soṭa 12a — 103
Baba Meṣi'a 59a-b — 180
Baba Meṣi'a 85b-86a — 50
Baba Batra 14b — 50
Baba Batra 121b — 176
Sanhedrin 38b — 50, 92
Sanhedrin 98a-b — 206
Sanhedrin 108a — 200
'Aboda Zara 5a — 50
Zebaḥim 62a — 95, 202
Menaḥot 65a-b — 61
Menaḥot 110a — 95, 202

Midrashim

Bereshit Rabbati (ed. Albeck)
24.22-23 — 137
26.10-24 — 137

Deuteronomy Rabbah
11 — 122, 146

Genesis Rabbah
5.5 — 156
12.6 — 103
17.5 — 91
18.6 — 100
20.12 — 97
22.7 — 101
22.8 — 102
22.13 — 50
23.5 — 127
23.6 — 134
23.7 — 156
24.2 — 50
24.6 — 134
25.1 — 185
26.3 — 28, 55
44.17 — 91
53.14 — 133
56.11 — 54
63.10 — 54

Mekhilta
Baḥodeš 6 — 155
Beshallaḥ 2 — 200

Sifre Deuteronomy (ed. Finkelstein)
§43 — 156, 200

Tanḥuma
Bereshit §9 — 102
Noaḥ §18 — 156

Tanḥuma Buber
Bereshit §28 — 50
Bereshit §29 — 50
Bereshit §32 — 50

Targumim

Targum Jonathan

2 Kgs 2:11 — 203
Ezek 9:2 — 189

Targum *Ketuvim*
Ps 92:1 — 50

Targum Onqelos
Gen 2:7 — 181
Gen 3:21 — 97
Deut 30:4 — 203

Targum Pseudo-Jonathan
Gen 2:7 — 181
Gen 3:21 — 97
Gen 4:1 — 100, 134
Gen 4:8 — 102
Gen 5:3 — 134
Gen 5:24 — 57
Gen 14:18 — 28, 55
Gen 22:19 — 54
Gen 24:62 — 54
Gen 25:22 — 54

Targum *Yerušalmi I*
Gen 14:18 — 28, 55
Gen 25:22 — 54

Miscellaneous Rabbinic Texts

'Abot de Rabbi Natan
A 1 — 97
A 31 — 50
A 34 — 94
A *hosafah beth* — 156

Derek Ereṣ Zuṭa
1 — 23

Hekhalot Zuṭarti
181

Massekhet Kelim
152, 160

Pesiqta Rabbati
23 — 50

Pirqe Rabbi Eliezer
4 — 200
13 — 101
13-14 — 91
14 — 96, 97
21 — 100, 101, 102, 134
22 — 52, 134, 200
27 — 28, 55

Seder 'Olam Rabbah
1 — 176
21 — 23
30 — 50

Sefer ha-Bahir (ed. Margalioth)
§200 — 91

Soferim
1:2 — 61

Zohar
Bereshit 35b — 52
Bereshit 37b — 51
Bereshit 55b — 50
Yitro 70a — 51

VI. Graeco-Jewish Literature

Josephus
Antiquities
1.69-71 — 37, 142
1.70 — 136
1.70-71 — 95
1.158 — 26

Philo
Abr. 17-18 — 199
L.A. 1.31-32 — 90
L.A. 1.53-55 — 90
L.A. 1.88-96 — 90
L.A. 2.4 — 90
Op. 69-71 — 90
Op. 134-47 — 90
Post. Cain. 10 — 113
Post. Cain. 170 — 113
Quaest. in Gen. 1.4 — 90
Quaest. in Gen. 1.78 — 113
Quaest. in Gen. 2.56 — 90

VII. Christian and Patristic Literature

Acts of Thomas
112 — 91

Augustine
Contra Faustum
19.3 — 26

20.2 — 99
20.11 — 99
De haeresibus
46.5 — 21
De morib. Manich.
19.73 — 104

Barnabas
2:10 — 35, 51
4:3 — 63
16:5 — 63
16:6 — 63

Cave of Treasures (Riessler)
2.12-3.8 — 97
2.17 — 104
4.15-17 — 97
5.29 — 102
6.2 — 103
6.2-3 — 138
6.14 — 138

Ephrem Syrus
Hymns against Heresies
22.14 — 27
24.16.5-6 — 133
Prose Refutations
1.8.5 — 27
1.43.40-44 — 21
1.75 — 27
1.136.23ff. — 179
2.208-209 — 26
2.208.17-29 — 26

Epiphanius
Panarion
19.1.4 — 63
19.1.5 — 64
19.2.2 — 59, 140
19.3.4 — 139
20.3.4 — 63
26 — 115
26.8.1 — 51, 53, 77, 132
30.3.1-6 — 22
30.16.9 — 21
39 — 115
39.1.3 — 126
39.2.1-2 — 101
39.2.1-7 — 101
39.2.3-4 — 134
39.2.3-7 — 131
39.3.5 — 53, 126
39.5.1 — 53, 132, 138
40 — 114, 115
40.1.1 — 132
40.1.2-3 — 115
40.2.2 — 131
40.5.3ff. — 101, 131
40.7.1 — 101, 134
40.7.1-2 — 134
40.7.1-3 — 125
40.7.1-5 — 131
40.7.4 — 53
40.7.5 — 127, 132
53 — 47
53.1.1 — 59, 63
53.1.8 — 22
55 — 94
66.1.4-3.9 — 28
66.25.7 — 137, 179
66.26.3 — 106
66.28.9 — 107
66.29.1 — 100
66.30.6 — 107
66.31.2 — 21
66.54.2 — 100
66.74.1 — 21
70 — 132

Eusebius of Caesarea
Historia ecclesiastica
6.16.3 — 61
6.38 — 21, 59
Praeparatio evangelica
9.17.9 — 57

Hippolytus
Refutatio
5.2.20 — 53
5.22 — 55
5.26.23 — 101
9.13.1 — 59
9.15.1 — 139
9.16.4 — 206
10.29.2 — 22

Irenaeus
Adversus haereses
1.20.1 — 63
1.27.1 — 21
1.29-30 — 132
1.29.2 — 201
1.30.1-2 — 101
1.30.7 — 100, 101

1.30.7-8 — 101

Lactantius
Div. Inst.
7.17.11 — 139

Pseudo-Clementine *Homilies*
1.19 — 22
2.4-12 — 22
3.17-28 — 22
11.19 — 22
17.4.3 — 23

Pseudo-Clementine *Recognitions*
1.16 — 22
1.21 — 22
2.22.4 — 22
2.47 — 23
8.59-62 — 22
10.51 — 22

Pseudo-Tertullian
2 — 101

Questions of Bartholomew
52-55 — 96

Shepherd of Hermas
Vis. 1.1.3 — 156

Theodoret
Haereticarum fabularum compendium
1.26 — 93

VIII. Nag Hammadi Literature

Allogenes
50.20 — 93
52.14 — 93
55.18 — 93
55.34 — 93
57.25 — 93
58.27-33 — 136

Apocalypse of Adam
64.6-12 — 97
64.14-19 — 95
64.16-19 — 77
65.4-5 — 139
65.8 — 139
65.11 — 90
65.26-31 — 69
65.26-66.8 — 99, 133
66.2-3 — 91
66.2-6 — 69
66.4-6 — 139
66.25-28 — 101
67.1-14 — 103
67.14ff. — 69
69.12-15 — 139
71.9-10 — 139
72.1-15 — 90
75.17-21 — 139
76.7 — 139
76.9-10 — 69
77.27-82.19 — 139
85.28-29 — 139

Apocryphon of James
14.34 — 203

Apocryphon of John
1.17-19 — 157
7.30-8.25 — 201
8.24 — 90
10.8-9 — 101, 106
10.34-36 — 102
11.8-19 — 94
11.15-19 — 91
11.26-34 — 101
15.13-23 — 132-33
19.6-10 — 139
24.15-25 — 101, 102
24.16-19 — 101
24.34-25.1 — 134
29.16-30.11 — 102

First Apocalypse of James
30.18-42.19 — 157

Gospel of the Egyptians
44.27 — 93
49.1-2 — 139
50.2 — 93
51.15-22 — 201
51.20 — 155
52.10-16 — 201
53.25 — 93
54.11 — 155
55.17 — 155
55.22 — 93
56.13-14 — 155
56.[20] — 93
57.4 — 101

57.5-58.21 — 98
57.16-17 — 99
57.17 — 99
57.21-22 — 99
58.[15-17] — 102
59.15 — 155
59.23 — 93
60.1 — 155
60.8 — 155
60.9 — 155
60.9-18 — 131, 139
60.14 — 155
60.15 — 155
60.32 — 139
61.16 — 155
61.23 — 155
62.6 — 93
62.19 — 155
62.24 — 155
63.11 — 155
64.1-3 — 126
64.1-9 — 127
64.2 — 155
64.24 — 155
64.26 — 201
65.16-18 — 126
65.17 — 155
65.20 — 155
65.23 — 93
68.2 — 155
68.10 — 155
71.10-11 — 134

Gospel of Thomas
4 — 53

Hypostasis of the Archons
87.3-4 — 91
87.28-29 — 101
89.21-23 — 133
91.30-33 — 134
93.9ff. — 201
94.14-17 — 101, 106
94.25-26 — 91
97.1-3 — 161

Letter of Peter to Philip
133.13-138.7 — 157

Melchizedek
6.4-5 — 201
8.6 — 90

On the Origin of the World
100.7 — 101, 106
100.24-26 — 101, 106
103.18 — 91
110.8-10 — 151
116.15-20 — 133
119.15ff. — 103
119.17-18 — 101
123.8-11 — 102

Paraphrase of Shem
1.9-11 — 166
1.21-28 — 178
41.21-24 — 166

Second Treatise of the Great Seth
70.12 — 155

Sophia of Jesus Christ
90.14-91.13 — 157

Three Steles of Seth
118.26 — 90

Trimorphic Protennoia
38.31-39.13 — 201
39.23-24 — 101
39.26-27 — 91

Zostrianos
3.23-28 — 156
4.20-25 — 136
4.20-31 — 125
6.23 — 90
13.16 — 90
29.2-20 — 201
51.7 — 90
52.14 — 93
54.17 — 93
57.15 — 93
62.12 — 93
63.11 — 93
125.14 — 93
127.18-128.7 — 201

IX. Manichaica

Acta Archelai
7.4 — 137, 179
8.3 — 89, 106
9.4-5 — 107

10.8 — 107
11.1 — 100
12.1-2 — 89
12.2 — 107
12.4-5 — 90
13.2 — 106
62-64 — 28
64.5 — 63

Alexander of Lycopolis
Contra Manichaei (ed. Brinkmann)
§3 — 179
§4 — 89, 106, 179
§23 — 89

Cologne Mani Codex (*CMC*)
1-13 — 6
3.13-14 — 133
13.5-6 — 140
13.11 — 140
14-44 — 6
14.1 — 179
17.11 — 150
17.12-16 — 91
19.4-7 — 137, 138, 180
34.1-9 — 99
34.1-10 — 178
45-72 — 6, 15
45.1-8 — 29
45.1-48.15 — 29
47.1-48.15 — 29
47.1-49.15 — 160
47.3-11 — 89
48.16-50.7 — 20, 89, 146
49.5-10 — 152
50.1-4 — 119
50.8-52.7 — 20, 130
50.17-18 — 133
50.19 — 119
51.1-6 — 112
51.6 — 117
51.11-12 — 120
51.15-18 — 120
52.3-4 — 117
52.8-55.9 — 20, 155
53.11-12 — 124
54.11-17 — 74
54.14-15 — 146
55.8-9 — 146
55.10-58.5 — 20, 176
55.13-16 — 156
55.15-56.3 — 157
55.17-18 — 157
57.4-11 — 157
57.11-14 — 169
57.14-17 — 169
58.6-60.7 — 20
58.6-60.12 — 199
58.23 — 150
59.1-3 — 157
59.22-23 — 145
60.18-23 — 20
61.2-14 — 20
61.16-22 — 20
63.16-23 — 161
63.21-23 — 21
64.8-65.22 — 20
66.4-68.5 — 20
68.6-69.8 — 20
69.9-70.10 — 20
70.10-23 — 24, 161
70.10-72.7 — 29
70.20-22 — 21
71.6-72.4 — 29
71.6-72.7 — 160
72-99 — 6
72.4-7 — 24
77.13-79.12 — 159
80.6-18 — 21
87.19-22 — 21
89.9-90.2 — 21
91.19-93.23 — 63
99.9 — 18
100-116 — 6
117-192 — 6

Homilies
7-42 — 23
13.27-28 — 22
32.20 — 139
33.23 — 139
61.23 — 104, 130
68 — 28
68.15-19 — 28
68.17 — 14
69.26ff. — 28
70.2-17 — 28
70.18ff. — 28
85.33 — 139
94.18-19 — 24

Ibn al-Nadīm
Fihrist (ed. Flügel, *Mani*)
49-80 — 19

50.10-13 — 92
55.2 — 100
55.3-7 — 179
56.12 — 92
58-59 — 106
58-61 — 79-81
58.15-59.7 — 91
60-61 — 134
60.7-13 — 134
61.1-3 — 130
61.3-5 — 131
61.5 — 130
61.8 — 130
61.10 — 130
63.11-12 — 107
72.10-11 — 24
73.1 — 51
74.13 — 130

Kephalaia
7.18-8.7 — 21
7.27-30 — 139
9.11-16.31 — 23
9.24-14.4 — 21
12.9-12 — 28
12.10-11 — 130
12.12 — 28
12.14-20 — 21
12.15-17 — 28
12.17-19 — 28
12.19-13.11 — 28
13.19-26 — 28
14.4-6 — 13, 24, 161
14.26-29 — 171
20.17-18 — 106
23.17 — 139
25.11 — 139
25.20-22 — 106
28.15-22 — 106
30.17 — 139
35.22 — 21, 70
36.3-6 — 21
38.20 — 137, 180
39.19-24 — 124, 179
42.27-32 — 53
42.29 — 130
87.27-28 — 106
87.33-88.33 — 107
88 — 107
118.3 — 107
119.8-20 — 107
120ff. — 107
125 — 107
137.15-22 — 98
138.1-5 — 98
138.17-18 — 98
145.26-27 — 130
167.6-9 — 179
168.12-16 — 107
213-216 — 107
221.18-223.16 — 20
272.27-29 — 179
273.20 — 179
299.2-4 — 28
299.2-12 — 22
299.4-10 — 28
299.11-12 — 28
299.23-24 — 28

Middle Iranian Texts

M 4b — 92, 202
M 17 — 24
M 20 — 92, 202
M 22 — 28, 130
M 28 — 20
M 42 — 21
M 101 — 130
M 172 I — 24
M 178 — 107
M 196 — 92
M 299a — 14
M 363 — 22
M 528 — 103, 104, 108, 134
M 781 — 202
M 1202 — 92, 202
M 1314 — 202
M 1315 — 202
M 1859 — 88, 130
M 2309 — 87-88, 105
M 4500 — 84-85, 100
M 4501 — 85-86, 104, 134
M 4502 — 87
M 4503 — 87
M 5566 — 85-86, 104, 134
M 5567 — 86-87, 106
M 5794 — 23, 49, 95
M 7800 — 98, 106
M 7982 — 81, 89
M 7983 I — 81, 100
M 7984 I — 81
M 8280 — 88, 105

Psalm-Book

2.5 — 138, 180
46.20 — 24
142.3-9 — 28
142.4 — 130
142.11-16 — 28
142.31-143.3 — 28
144.1-146.13 — 112

Theodore bar Konai
Liber Scholiorum (ed. Scher)
74-75 — 135, 139
286.5-11 — 58
297.7-12 — 105
307.1-3 — 59
311-318 — 19, 178
313.18-21 — 204
313.28-314.2 — 179
314.11 — 179
314.21-315.4 — 179
315.16-18 — 180
316.11-14 — 107
317-318 — 79
317.3-6 — 106
317.9-15 — 90-91
317.15-17 — 133
317.15-28 — 91
317.24 — 178
319-320 — 101, 132
320.2-3 — 138
320.21-23 — 133
345.4 — 137
345.4-5 — 130

X. Miscellaneous Texts

Bundahishn
§14 — 105

Corpus Hermeticum
I — 145
I.1 — 145, 156
I.3 — 145, 156
IV — 26

Diodorus Siculus
1.96-98 — 28
3.60.2 — 57
4.27.4-5 — 57

Diogenes Laertius
3.6-7 — 28

Right Ginzā (ed. Lidzbarski)
7.3-4 — 151
27.19-28.7 — 155
28.3-7 — 178
45.22-46.6 — 155
46.2-6 — 178
118.18 — 131
202.26 — 140
208.16-20 — 137
209.3-7 — 137
209.21-24 — 137
209.31-36 — 137
210.3-6 — 137
251.12-14 — 155
251.12-282.13 — 54
262.1-7 — 156
262.27-30 — 157
264.4ff. — 145
264.15-18 — 157
269.4-6 — 156
270.4-6 — 147
280.25-282.13 — 159
286.13-15 — 54
410.6-8 — 178

Left Ginzā (ed. Lidzbarski)
424.22-429.23 — 156
426.31-32 — 130
427.2 — 130
427.4 — 130
427.12-13 — 130
427.19 — 130
427.20-21 — 130
427.24 — 130
427.32 — 130
427.35 — 130
427.38 — 130
428.2-4 — 137
428.3 — 130
428.5 — 130
428.12-13 — 130
429.3 — 130
429.3-11 — 137
429.17 — 130
429.22-23 — 130
498.20-22 — 138
571.13-20 — 138
573.13-21 — 137

PGM
III.18 — 95
IV.78 — 95

IV.1020 — 92
VII.193 — 95
VII.703 — 95
XII.495 — 92
XIII.928 — 202
XXXVI.70-71 — 95
XXXVI.102 — 95

Pistis Sophia
1-3 — 157
2.99 — 57
3.134 — 57
4.141 — 157

Pliny
5.15.73 — 60

Plutarch
De Iside et Osiride 10 — 28

Qur'ān
2:34 — 96
2:62 — 159
2:136 — 211
3:30 — 22
4:163ff. — 22
5:27-31 — 131
5:69 — 159
6:83-86 — 22
7:11-13 — 96
15:29-35 — 96
17:61 — 96
18:50 — 96
19:42-59 — 22
19:56-57 — 58
20:116 — 96
21:85-86 — 58
22:17 — 159
38:71-78 — 96

INDEX OF ANCIENT AND MEDIEVAL AUTHORITIES

'Abd al-Jabbār, 9, 10, 11, 23
Abraham ibn Daud, 61
Abraham ibn Ezra, 61, 92, 103, 134, 137, 181, 200
Abū 'Īsa al-Warrāq, 62
Abu'l-Ma'ālī, 25
Abū Ma'shar, 58
Alexander of Lycopolis, 13, 18, 89, 90, 106
Azariah di Rossi, 61

Berossus, 26
Bertinoro, 61
al-Bīrūnī, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 23, 24, 52, 61, 62, 90, 107, 151, 159, 160

Cedrenus, 51, 103, 136
Clement of Alexandria, 46

Daniel al-Qūmisī, 35
Dā'ūd b. Marwān al-Muqammiṣ, 61
Dionysius of Tel-Maḥrē, 134

Eleazar b. Judah of Worms, 34, 50
Ephrem Syrus, 9, 11, 12, 13, 21, 26, 27
Epiphanius, 8, 22, 24, 35, 36, 37, 42, 46, 47, 59, 115, 116, 117, 120, 124, 127
Eusebius, 42, 45
Evodius, 106

Hegemonius, 28, 63, 89, 100, 179
Hippolytus, 8, 36, 42

Ibn al-Murtaḍā, 23, 25
Ibn al-Nadīm, 5, 19, 25, 42, 52, 70, 79-81, 91, 92, 99, 100, 102, 103, 105, 108, 109, 113, 120, 130, 151, 159, 160, 168
Irenaeus, 36, 46, 209

al-Jāḥiẓ, 95, 98
John of Damascus, 42, 59, 63
Josephus, 42, 44
Justin Martyr, 46, 209

al-Kindī, 151, 160
al-Kisā'ī, 131

Manetho, 54
al-Mas'ūdī, 20, 21, 58, 62, 103
Michael Syrus, 58, 98, 132, 184, 199
Moshe ha-Darshan, 137
Moses of Chorene, 38, 142

al-Nawbakhtī, 9, 23

Origen, 21, 42, 45, 59, 74

Philo, 42, 68, 113, 185
Pliny the Elder, 43, 47, 60
Priscillian of Avila, 72
Pseudo-Chrysostom, 37, 121
Pseudo-Eupolemus, 57

Ramban, 34, 134
Rashi, 27, 50, 54, 61, 92, 156, 200
Recanati, 101

Salmon b. Jeroḥam, 38, 165, 166, 177
Severus of Antioch, 150, 159
Sforno, 118
al-Shahrastānī, 10, 11, 23, 25, 61, 62, 158, 159
Solomon of Basra, 142
Syncellus, 54, 56, 122, 136

al-Ṭabarī, 39, 55, 58, 96, 102, 131
Tertullian, 46
Theodore bar Konai, 5, 19, 42, 53, 58, 63, 69, 77, 100, 105, 106, 115, 116, 117, 132, 168, 194
Theodoret, 71
Timothy of Seleucia, 45
Titus of Bostra, 7, 21

Ya'qūb al-Qirqisānī, 61, 62

INDEX OF MODERN AUTHORS

Abbott, N., 51
Abegg, M.G., Jr., 54, 60
Abel, A., 25
Adam, A., 19, 21, 29, 52, 60, 63, 99, 179
Adler, W., 53, 54, 58, 136, 176, 205
Aland, B., 27
Albeck, H., 50, 101, 102, 133, 137, 156, 199
Alexander, P.S., 55, 63, 93, 95, 178, 201
Altmann, A., 90, 156
Amar, J.P., 26
Andersen, F.I., 55, 57, 199, 200
Anderson, G.A., 49
Andrae, T., 22
Andreas, F.C., 21, 49, 89, 104, 106, 205
Arendzen, J., 60, 157
Arnold-Döben, V., 139
Asmussen, J.P., 19, 106, 108
Assemani, J.S., 134
Attridge, H.W., 160

Bammel, E., 62
Barbier de Meynard, C., 21, 58, 103
Barc, B., 93, 98
Barton, J.M.T., 133, 137, 203
Bauer, W., 20
Baumgarten, A.I., 92
Baumgarten, J.M., 203
Baur, F.C., 93, 106
Beausobre, I. de, 47, 63, 99
Beck, E., 27, 133
Beck, R., 139
BeDuhn, J.D., 26, 107, 202, 204
Beeson, C.H., 28, 63, 89, 100, 179
Bekker, I., 51
Berger, K., 177
Bertrand, D.A., 55
Betz, H.D., 21, 92
Beyer, K., 56, 94, 158, 180
Bezold, C., 52, 96, 97
Bidez, J., 53, 135
Bietenhard, H., 201
Black, M., 24, 56, 137, 157, 159, 199, 205
Blau, J., 50
Blau, L., 180
Böhlig, A., 19, 20, 139
Bonwetsch, G.N., 56
Borsch, F.H., 90
Bosworth, C.E., 98
Bousset, W., 22, 28, 53, 93, 106, 135, 140
Bowley, J.E., 26
Box, G.H., 199
Boyce, M., 21, 23, 24, 28, 49, 89, 92, 95, 98, 100, 104, 105, 106, 139, 140, 201, 202
Brandt, W., 19, 59, 131, 137, 138, 160, 180
Braun, O., 61
Bregman, J., 18
Brière, M., 158, 159
Brinkmann, A., 18, 89, 106, 179
Brock, S.P., 53, 55, 56, 97, 134, 178
Brockelmann, C., 204
Brown, F., 205
Bryder, P., 103
Budge, E.A.W., 53, 54, 103, 135, 139, 140
Bundy, D., 51, 96, 178
Burchard, C., 60, 63
Burkitt, F.C., 20, 27

Cameron, R., 18, 91
Canivet, P., 130
Caquot, A., 203, 204
Cerfaux, L., 22
Chabot, J.-B., 53, 58, 98, 132, 135, 138, 199
Chadwick, H., 93, 98
Charles, R.H., 40, 49, 55, 56, 60, 133, 137, 158, 159, 165, 177, 203, 205

Charlesworth, J.H., 29, 52, 55, 136, 166, 177, 178, 205
Chiesa, B., 62
Christensen, A., 92
Chwolsohn, D., 159
Cirillo, L., 19, 21, 139
Collins, J.J., 29, 136, 157
Colpe, C., 20, 22, 25, 107
Copenhaver, B.P., 54
Couliano, I.P., 100, 107, 140
Courteille, P., 21, 58, 103
Cowley, A., 60, 158
Coyle, J.K., 18
Cross, F.M., Jr., 60, 158
Cumont, F., 53, 99, 105, 106, 135

Dan, J., 50
Davidson, I., 177
De Goeje, M.J., 55, 102, 131
Delcor, M., 157
Denis, A.-M., 51, 56, 205
Dewey, A.J., 18, 91
Dietrich, A., 19, 27, 97
Di Lella, A.A., 60
Dillmann, A., 55, 56
Dodge, B., 19, 23, 25, 160
Donadoni, S., 56
Doresse, J., 55
Draguet, R., 19
Drijvers, H.J.W., 20, 27, 64, 96
Drower, E.S., 63
Duchesne-Guillemin, J., 105
Dupont-Sommer, A., 60, 137, 160, 203

Eisenberg, I., 131
Eissfeldt, O., 61
Epstein, J.N., 104, 202
Erder, Y., 58

Fabricius, J.A., 54
Fallon, F.T., 157
Fauth, W., 92
Festugière, A.-J., 27, 54, 160
Finkelstein, L., 156, 200
Fitzmyer, J.A., 27, 102, 157, 158
Flemming, J., 55, 203
Flügel, G., 19, 20, 24, 25, 51, 59, 79, 89, 91, 92, 100, 101, 102, 104, 106, 107, 130, 131, 134, 159, 179
Foerster, W., 137
Forbes, N., 56
Fossum, J.E., 62, 90, 94
Fowden, G., 21, 26, 28, 54
Fraade, S.D., 54, 155, 199
Frankfurter, D., 30, 58
Friedlaender, I., 22, 23, 25
Friedmann, M., 50
Fück, J., 22, 58

Gardner, I., 18
Gaster, M., 176
Gaster, T.H., 160
Gaylord, H.E., 96
Geiger, A., 61
Gero, S., 20, 46, 63
Gil, M., 159
Gimaret, D., 25
Ginzberg, L., 50, 55, 57, 68, 90, 96, 101, 156, 164, 176, 178, 199
Giversen, S., 19, 206
Gnoli, G., 96
Goehring, J.E., 18
Götze, A., 96
Goitein, S.D., 60, 64
Golb, N., 60, 62, 160
Goldstein, J.A., 205
Goodman, M., 55, 206
Gottheil, R.J.H., 135, 176
Graffin, R., 51, 52
Greenfield, J.C., 60, 61, 93, 158, 202, 206
Grenet, F., 139, 140, 201
Grintz, Y.M., 61
Gruenwald, I., 29, 93, 108, 147, 157, 180, 181, 203
Gündüz, S., 63
Guidi, I., 158, 159
Gunkel, H., 201

Hallier, L., 26
Harkavy, A., 62
Harnack, A. von, 20
Harper, R.F., 205
Harrington, D.J., 157, 158
Hartman, L., 56
Hartman, S.S., 178
Hedrick, C.W., 20, 63, 92, 136
Hengel, M., 160
Hennecke, E., 96
Henning, W.B., 14, 21, 22, 28, 49, 89, 92, 95, 104, 106, 107, 108, 130, 205
Henrichs, A., 18, 19, 20, 24, 29, 91, 92, 95, 133, 138, 144, 156, 170, 171
Hespel, R., 19

Higger, M., 200
Hilgenfeld, A., 19
Himmelfarb, M., 29, 55, 136, 165, 176, 177, 181, 200, 201
Hindley, J.C., 206
Hodgson, R., Jr., 20, 63, 92, 136
Holl, K., 21, 59, 132, 134
Holmes, S., 199
Hopkins, S., 166, 177, 184, 199
Horovitz, H.S., 155, 200
Horst, P.W. van der, 18
Houtsma, M.T., 102, 131
Hultgård, A., 201
Humphreys, R.S., 60
Hutter, M., 24, 28, 89, 105, 106, 107, 108

Idel, M., 189, 200
Isaac, E., 203

Jackson, A.V.W., 19, 100, 105, 178
James, M.R., 51, 56, 103, 133, 136
Jellinek, A., 50, 156, 165, 176, 177
Jeremias, G., 63
Jolivet, J., 160
Jones, F.S., 19
Jonge, M. de, 158, 176, 199, 201

Kahle, P., 60
Kampen, J., 99
Kessler, K., 21, 23, 25, 95, 98
Kilani, M.S., 25, 61, 158, 159
Klijn, A.F.J., 19, 22, 52, 54, 64
Klimkeit, H.-J., 21, 92, 106, 107, 108, 202
Kmosko, M., 52
Knibb, M.A., 24, 56, 103, 137, 157, 180, 201, 204, 205, 206
Kobelski, P.J., 94, 180
Köbert, R., 18
Koenen, L., 18, 19, 24, 29, 59, 89, 91, 92, 95, 99, 130, 133, 138, 139, 144, 152, 155, 156, 158, 160, 170, 171, 176, 178, 180, 199
Koester, H., 20
Kolenkow, A.B., 30
Kotter, B., 59
Kraeling, C.H., 89, 90
Kraft, R.A., 20, 30, 51, 63
Krause, M., 53, 132
Krodel, G., 20
Kugener, M.-A., 99, 105, 106
Kuhn, H.-W., 63

Lagarde, P.A. de, 21, 51, 201
Lawlor, H.S., 205
Layton, B., 20, 53, 132, 134, 156, 157
Lazarus-Yafeh, H., 62
Levi Della Vida, G., 135
Lidzbarski, M., 54, 98, 130, 131, 137, 138, 139, 140, 145, 147, 151, 155, 156, 157, 158, 159, 178, 204
Lieberman, S., 57
Lieu, S.N.C., 19, 20, 21, 27, 28, 100, 139
Lipiński, E., 158
Lockwood, W., 62
Luria, D., 52, 97, 100, 101, 102, 134, 200
Luttikhuizen, G.P., 19, 59

MacDermot, V., 28, 57
MacKenzie, D.N., 23
MacRae, G.W., 96
McVey, K., 26
Mann, J., 50
Mansfeld, J., 18
Margalioth, M., 50, 55, 93, 177
Margoliouth, D.S., 160
Markon, I., 50
Massignon, L., 26
Mathews, E.G., Jr., 26
Mazzaoui, M.M., 58
Ménard, J.-É., 55
Metzger, B.M., 180
Meyer, M., 202
Milik, J.T., 24, 47, 56, 60, 61, 63, 73, 94, 95, 157, 158, 160, 180, 202, 205, 206
Millar, F., 55, 92, 206
Mingana, A., 55, 177
Mirecki, P., 202
Mitchell, C.W., 20, 21, 26, 27, 179
Monneret de Villard, U., 135
Monnot, G., 22, 23, 25, 160
Montgomery, J.A., 93, 104, 202
Moore, G.F., 205
Moreen, V.B., 58
Morfill, W.R., 56
Morray-Jones, C.R.A., 63
Mosshammer, A.A., 54, 136
Mras, K., 57
Müntner, S., 55, 176, 177

Nau, F., 51
Naveh, J., 92, 93, 95, 202

Nemoy, L., 61, 62
Netton, I.R., 23
Netzer, A., 96
Neubauer, A., 61, 176
Newsom, C., 95, 201
Nickelsburg, G.W.E., 30, 56, 204, 206
Nöldeke, T., 92, 130, 131, 137

Odeberg, H., 206
Oesterley, W.O.E., 199
Olyan, S.M., 130
Overbeck, J.J., 204

Panaino, A., 96
Pass, H.L., 60, 157
Paul, A., 61
Pearson, B.A., 18, 28, 92, 94, 95, 103, 126, 134, 138, 155
Pellat, C., 62, 98
Pennington, A., 49, 55, 57, 95, 97, 204, 205
Perkins, P., 51
Peters, F.E., 58
Peterson, E., 160
Philonenko, M., 200, 203
Pines, S., 57
Plessner, M., 58
Pognon, H., 19, 130, 132, 178
Poznanski, S., 61, 62
Preisendanz, K., 71, 74
Prigent, P., 51
Puech, E., 61, 94
Puech, H.-C., 20, 21, 24, 25, 28, 100, 104, 115, 132, 134, 138, 178, 203

Qimron, E., 137
Quispel, G., 203

Rabin, C., 49, 55, 205
Rabin, I.A., 155, 200
Rashed, R., 160
Reeves, J.C., 19, 20, 21, 22, 24, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 52, 55, 57, 59, 60, 63, 64, 89, 91, 92, 94, 95, 98, 99, 100, 104, 107, 133, 134, 135, 137, 140, 158, 159, 160, 176, 177, 179, 180, 200, 203, 204, 206
Reif, S.C., 50
Reinink, G.J., 19, 22, 51, 64
Reitzenstein, R., 19, 100, 134, 135, 143, 155, 156
Revel, B., 61
Rey-Coquais, J.-P., 130
Ri, S.-M., 51, 96, 102, 103, 104, 138
Ries, J., 18
Riessler, P., 97, 138
Robinson, J.M., 20, 90, 94, 97, 99, 131, 136, 138, 139, 156, 178
Robinson, S.E., 51, 52
Römer, C., 18, 89, 99, 130, 133, 155, 156, 158, 176, 178, 180, 199
Rofé, A., 181
Roncaglia, M.P., 22
Roselli, A., 21, 139
Rosenthal, F., 155
Rubin, U., 103
Rudolph, K., 19, 20, 54, 55, 90, 98, 124, 130, 131, 137, 138, 155, 160, 167, 178

Sachau, C.E., 23, 52, 61, 90, 107, 159
Salmond, S.D.F., 63
Schaeder, H.H., 19, 20, 104, 135, 155, 156
Schäfer, P., 57, 93, 137, 155, 181, 200, 201
Schechter, S., 43, 44, 50, 60, 97, 156
Scheftelowitz, I., 160
Scher, A., 19, 58, 59, 79, 90, 91, 98, 106, 107, 130, 132, 133, 135, 137, 138, 139, 178, 179, 180, 204
Schiffman, L.H., 60
Schmidt, C., 28, 57
Schmidt, N., 205, 206
Schneemelcher, W., 96
Scholem, G., 50, 71, 91, 92, 93, 98, 156, 160
Scholz, P.O., 205
Schürer, E., 55, 60, 206
Scopello, M., 93
Scott, W., 54
Séd, N., 156
Segal, A.F., 90, 94
Segelberg, E., 178
Shaked, S., 92, 93, 95, 181, 202
Sims-Williams, N., 107
Sjöberg, E., 206
Skehan, P.W., 60
Sokoloff, M., 199
Sparks, H.F.D., 24, 49, 55, 56, 57, 95, 103, 133, 137, 157, 176, 180, 201, 203, 204, 205
Speyer, H., 96
Stegemann, H., 63

Stempel, R., 205
Stern, S.M., 22
Stone, M.E., 30, 34, 49, 50, 51, 60, 61, 95, 96, 134, 158, 206
Strecker, G., 19, 22
Stroumsa, G.G., 18, 22, 28, 51, 53, 54, 55, 57, 90, 101, 102, 113, 131, 136, 139, 201
Sukenik, E.L., 157
Sundermann, W., 19, 20, 24, 84, 89, 98, 99, 104, 105, 106, 107, 108, 109, 130
Sussmann, Y., 61
Swartz, M.L., 22

Talmon, S., 156
Tardieu, M., 13, 19, 21, 22, 23, 25, 26, 27, 28, 53, 130, 132, 160
Taylor, A.E., 160
Theodor, J., 50, 100, 101, 102, 133, 156, 199
Thomson, R.W., 54, 155
Tongerloo, A. van, 19, 206
Torrey, C.C., 131
Trebolle Barrera, J., 61
Tubach, J., 205
Turner, J.D., 136
Turner, N., 133

Ullendorff, E., 206

Vaillant, A., 57
Vajda, G., 23, 28, 58, 94, 131
VanderKam, J.C., 58, 60, 159, 177, 205
Van Lindt, P., 18, 21, 28, 90, 160
Vaux, R. de, 61
Vegas Montaner, L., 61
Vermes, G., 55, 60, 201, 206
Villey, A., 18
Visotzky, B.L., 20, 28, 71, 73, 92, 130, 145, 156, 180

Wacholder, B.Z., 26, 54, 58, 60, 61
Wagner, S., 59
Wallis, R.T., 18
Wasserstrom, S.M., 25, 50, 62, 63, 64, 94, 96
Weinstock, I., 93
Weiser, A., 61
Welburn, A.J., 135, 139
Wellhausen, J., 159
Wells, L.S.A., 93
Whittaker, M., 203
Widengren, G., 22, 27, 29, 49, 54, 135, 137, 139
Wieder, N., 61
Witakowski, W., 135
Woude, A.S. van der, 95

Zaehner, R.C., 105